

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 240  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	8	24	6	3.72	1391/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	6	8	22	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	9	14	15	2	3.14	1310/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	5	12	15	3	3.46	1421/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	1	10	12	7	3.83	986/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	3	8	8	1	3.24	1383/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	8	12	15	3.95	1119/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	6	31	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	13	16	4	3.63	1288/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	11	29	4.60	731/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	14	25	4.44	1289/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	5	23	11	3.95	1173/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	19	16	4.09	1079/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	5	2	6	15	14	3.74	928/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	7	7	16	1	2.83	1311/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	8	10	8	10	3.30	1259/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	9	2	19	7	3	2.83	1323/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	5	5	8	11	9	3.37	763/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	4	2	3	3	1	2.62	238/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.62	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	7	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	5	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	4	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	5	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	0	2	3	0	2.44	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	4	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	3	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 240  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 241  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	8	24	6	3.72	1391/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	6	8	22	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	9	14	15	2	3.14	1310/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	5	12	15	3	3.46	1421/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	1	10	12	7	3.83	986/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	3	8	8	1	3.24	1383/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	8	12	15	3.95	1119/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	6	31	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	3	7	16	6	1	2.85	1547/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	4	15	16	4.08	1248/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	2	5	12	20	4.20	1419/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	6	3	8	13	7	3.32	1443/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	7	10	12	3	3.03	1476/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	6	2	13	7	5	3.09	1208/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	7	7	16	1	2.83	1311/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	8	10	8	10	3.30	1259/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	9	2	19	7	3	2.83	1323/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	5	5	8	11	9	3.37	763/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	4	2	3	3	1	2.62	238/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.62	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	7	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	5	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	4	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	5	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	0	2	3	0	2.44	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	4	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	3	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 241  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 242  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	8	24	6	3.72	1391/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	6	8	22	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	9	14	15	2	3.14	1310/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	5	12	15	3	3.46	1421/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	1	10	12	7	3.83	986/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	3	8	8	1	3.24	1383/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	8	12	15	3.95	1119/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	6	31	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	8	14	9	4.03	897/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	839/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	14	15	4.38	1339/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	6	12	13	4.13	1064/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	8	13	7	3.80	1246/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	3	3	4	8	7	3.52	1039/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	7	7	16	1	2.83	1311/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	8	10	8	10	3.30	1259/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	9	2	19	7	3	2.83	1323/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	5	5	8	11	9	3.37	763/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	4	2	3	3	1	2.62	238/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.62	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	7	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	5	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	4	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	5	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	0	2	3	0	2.44	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	4	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	3	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 242  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 243  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	8	24	6	3.72	1391/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	6	8	22	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	9	14	15	2	3.14	1310/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	5	12	15	3	3.46	1421/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	1	10	12	7	3.83	986/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	3	8	8	1	3.24	1383/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	8	12	15	3.95	1119/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	6	31	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	8	14	9	4.03	897/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	839/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	13	16	4.41	1321/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	6	10	15	4.19	1010/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	9	12	8	3.87	1216/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	3	2	5	8	7	3.56	1020/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	7	7	16	1	2.83	1311/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	8	10	8	10	3.30	1259/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	9	2	19	7	3	2.83	1323/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	5	5	8	11	9	3.37	763/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	4	2	3	3	1	2.62	238/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.62	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	7	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	5	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	4	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	5	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	0	2	3	0	2.44	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	4	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	3	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 243  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	23				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 244  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	0	2	3	11	28	10	3.76	1376/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	3	17	23	10	3.70	1382/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	3	9	11	21	8	3.42	1236/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	11	4	4	14	14	7	3.37	1456/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	815/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	0	11	10	10	3.79	1101/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	5	7	19	22	4.09	984/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	1	7	43	4.72	977/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	1	0	1	5	11	9	4.08	875/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	3	11	35	4.60	731/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	3	13	32	4.55	1193/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	3	6	17	22	4.21	992/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	2	3	2	12	27	4.28	945/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	3	2	6	9	23	4.09	638/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	5	5	17	12	3.59	1043/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	4	6	14	15	3.74	1104/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	3	8	15	15	3.88	1039/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	7	0	5	14	13	3.67	645/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	3	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	3	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	4	0	0	3	1	2.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 244  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 60 Non-major 60
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		
			? 0	Other 11	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 245  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	0	2	3	11	28	10	3.76	1376/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	3	17	23	10	3.70	1382/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	3	9	11	21	8	3.42	1236/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	11	4	4	14	14	7	3.37	1456/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	815/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	0	11	10	10	3.79	1101/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	5	7	19	22	4.09	984/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	1	7	43	4.72	977/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	0	1	1	11	10	0	3.30	1440/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	7	11	21	4.36	1031/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	1	1	4	12	22	4.32	1371/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	1	5	16	14	4.03	1118/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	5	1	5	11	13	3.74	1283/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	8	0	1	6	9	10	4.08	650/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	5	5	17	12	3.59	1043/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	4	6	14	15	3.74	1104/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	3	8	15	15	3.88	1039/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	7	0	5	14	13	3.67	645/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	3	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	3	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	4	0	0	3	1	2.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 245  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 60 Non-major 60
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		
			? 0	Other 11	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 246  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	0	2	3	11	28	10	3.76	1376/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	3	17	23	10	3.70	1382/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	3	9	11	21	8	3.42	1236/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	11	4	4	14	14	7	3.37	1456/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	815/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	0	11	10	10	3.79	1101/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	5	7	19	22	4.09	984/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	1	7	43	4.72	977/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	0	0	0	7	8	5	3.90	1060/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	6	8	13	4.14	1205/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	1	1	5	9	15	4.16	1429/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	2	5	9	12	4.11	1083/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	2	3	4	7	9	3.72	1295/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	4	0	5	3	4	10	3.86	842/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	5	5	17	12	3.59	1043/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	4	6	14	15	3.74	1104/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	3	8	15	15	3.88	1039/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	7	0	5	14	13	3.67	645/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	3	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	3	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	4	0	0	3	1	2.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 246  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 247  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	0	2	3	11	28	10	3.76	1376/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	3	17	23	10	3.70	1382/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	3	9	11	21	8	3.42	1236/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	11	4	4	14	14	7	3.37	1456/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	815/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	0	11	10	10	3.79	1101/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	5	7	19	22	4.09	984/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	1	7	43	4.72	977/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	0	1	2	6	8	3	3.50	1345/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	2	1	4	8	13	4.04	1265/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	1	2	4	9	15	4.13	1442/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	1	4	4	10	9	3.79	1282/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	4	2	3	7	9	3.60	1344/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	5	0	4	2	5	10	4.00	690/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	5	5	17	12	3.59	1043/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	4	6	14	15	3.74	1104/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	3	8	15	15	3.88	1039/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	7	0	5	14	13	3.67	645/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	3	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	3	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	4	0	0	3	1	2.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 247  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 60 Non-major 60
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		
			? 0	Other 11	



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 248  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	11	26	17	3.83	1327/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	26	11	3.68	1395/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	21	16	8	3.22	1290/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	8	10	15	7	3.35	1467/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	7	14	15	13	3.59	1193/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	4	10	11	8	3.54	1240/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	15	18	17	3.72	1287/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	2	0	0	5	50	4.77	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	2	0	14	18	6	3.65	1268/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	14	41	4.61	715/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	15	41	4.64	1096/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	10	28	18	4.02	1122/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	12	19	22	3.92	1189/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	5	1	13	18	20	3.82	866/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	13	18	17	3.78	948/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	6	12	15	20	3.77	1092/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	9	16	3.38	1215/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	10	6	8	10	21	3.47	713/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 248  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 249  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	11	26	17	3.83	1327/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	26	11	3.68	1395/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	21	16	8	3.22	1290/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	8	10	15	7	3.35	1467/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	7	14	15	13	3.59	1193/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	4	10	11	8	3.54	1240/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	15	18	17	3.72	1287/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	2	0	0	5	50	4.77	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	1	2	25	7	2	3.19	1468/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	6	7	8	20	4.02	1270/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	4	3	10	24	4.32	1377/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	3	10	16	9	3.67	1332/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	3	3	2	9	9	12	3.71	1301/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	7	5	2	9	8	9	3.42	1090/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	13	18	17	3.78	948/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	6	12	15	20	3.77	1092/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	9	16	3.38	1215/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	10	6	8	10	21	3.47	713/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 249  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 250  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	11	26	17	3.83	1327/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	26	11	3.68	1395/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	21	16	8	3.22	1290/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	8	10	15	7	3.35	1467/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	7	14	15	13	3.59	1193/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	4	10	11	8	3.54	1240/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	15	18	17	3.72	1287/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	2	0	0	5	50	4.77	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	0	1	2	13	21	4.46	442/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	517/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	1	1	6	31	4.72	1003/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	0	1	14	21	4.46	715/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	1	2	9	21	4.41	818/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	7	1	2	4	4	15	4.15	590/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	13	18	17	3.78	948/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	6	12	15	20	3.77	1092/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	9	16	3.38	1215/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	10	6	8	10	21	3.47	713/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 250  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 251  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	11	26	17	3.83	1327/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	26	11	3.68	1395/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	21	16	8	3.22	1290/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	8	10	15	7	3.35	1467/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	7	14	15	13	3.59	1193/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	4	10	11	8	3.54	1240/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	15	18	17	3.72	1287/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	2	0	0	5	50	4.77	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	0	1	5	16	14	4.19	754/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	3	5	26	4.68	620/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	1	1	5	32	4.74	949/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	1	1	14	20	4.38	812/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	2	0	2	10	21	4.37	861/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	7	1	1	4	5	15	4.23	528/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	13	18	17	3.78	948/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	6	12	15	20	3.77	1092/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	9	16	3.38	1215/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	10	6	8	10	21	3.47	713/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 251  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	35				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 252  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	8	11	14	15	3.54	1489/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	17	16	13	3.64	1421/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	5	5	20	10	10	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	4	7	11	10	6	3.18	1504/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	5	6	9	9	9	3.29	1354/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	5	8	7	8	3.55	1234/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	5	17	13	14	3.68	1308/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	5	40	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	1	8	20	8	3.79	1159/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	10	6	33	4.40	983/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	3	0	4	5	37	4.49	1257/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	11	9	26	4.16	1028/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	13	5	28	4.18	1016/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	2	1	11	8	23	4.09	644/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	12	3	8	8	14	3.20	1209/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	5	6	10	17	3.61	1170/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	5	9	7	16	3.45	1193/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	5	3	7	8	13	3.58	682/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 252  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 253  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	8	11	14	15	3.54	1489/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	17	16	13	3.64	1421/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	5	5	20	10	10	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	4	7	11	10	6	3.18	1504/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	5	6	9	9	9	3.29	1354/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	5	8	7	8	3.55	1234/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	5	17	13	14	3.68	1308/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	5	40	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	1	4	13	13	4	3.43	1393/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	11	6	22	4.20	1169/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	2	6	5	27	4.43	1305/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	2	11	5	20	4.05	1105/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	2	12	5	18	3.90	1201/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	3	2	11	7	13	3.69	955/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	12	3	8	8	14	3.20	1209/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	5	6	10	17	3.61	1170/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	5	9	7	16	3.45	1193/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	5	3	7	8	13	3.58	682/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 253  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 254  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	8	11	14	15	3.54	1489/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	17	16	13	3.64	1421/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	5	5	20	10	10	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	4	7	11	10	6	3.18	1504/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	5	6	9	9	9	3.29	1354/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	5	8	7	8	3.55	1234/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	5	17	13	14	3.68	1308/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	5	40	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	3	14	12	5	3.56	1323/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	0	12	6	14	3.88	1354/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	2	10	7	17	4.08	1451/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	12	9	14	3.92	1209/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	2	3	11	5	14	3.74	1283/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	3	2	11	4	11	3.58	1011/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	12	3	8	8	14	3.20	1209/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	5	6	10	17	3.61	1170/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	5	9	7	16	3.45	1193/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	5	3	7	8	13	3.58	682/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 254  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 255  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	8	11	14	15	3.54	1489/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	17	16	13	3.64	1421/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	5	5	20	10	10	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	4	7	11	10	6	3.18	1504/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	5	6	9	9	9	3.29	1354/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	5	8	7	8	3.55	1234/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	5	17	13	14	3.68	1308/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	5	40	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	0	12	16	4	3.75	1192/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	2	1	10	7	15	3.91	1340/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	2	7	5	23	4.32	1371/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	2	2	8	7	19	4.03	1118/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	2	1	9	5	19	4.06	1098/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	3	2	10	5	13	3.70	955/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	12	3	8	8	14	3.20	1209/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	5	6	10	17	3.61	1170/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	5	9	7	16	3.45	1193/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	5	3	7	8	13	3.58	682/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 255  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 256  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	0	3	0	9	16	13	3.88	1295/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	3	11	13	11	3.77	1340/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	6	12	12	10	3.65	1153/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	3	7	16	2	3.61	1372/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	2	0	9	9	9	3.79	1026/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	1	6	9	4	3.43	1303/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	9	14	15	3.98	1074/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	945/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	0	0	5	17	4	3.96	972/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	9	29	4.63	699/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	3	6	28	4.61	1146/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	6	19	13	4.18	1010/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	6	10	20	4.32	911/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	2	4	13	17	4.16	582/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	9	3	10	7	7	3.00	1254/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	4	9	7	14	3.68	1142/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	4	10	10	8	3.39	1212/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	11	2	5	7	9	3.03	842/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.03	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	187/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 256  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 46 Non-major 45
84-150	0	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 22	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 257  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	0	3	0	9	16	13	3.88	1295/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	3	11	13	11	3.77	1340/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	6	12	12	10	3.65	1153/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	3	7	16	2	3.61	1372/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	2	0	9	9	9	3.79	1026/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	1	6	9	4	3.43	1303/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	9	14	15	3.98	1074/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	945/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	2	2	11	10	1	3.23	1456/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	2	2	7	7	17	4.00	1279/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	1	4	5	25	4.44	1289/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	4	1	10	13	6	3.47	1399/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	2	3	4	8	7	10	3.53	1362/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	4	3	7	6	9	3.45	1080/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	9	3	10	7	7	3.00	1254/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	4	9	7	14	3.68	1142/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	4	10	10	8	3.39	1212/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	11	2	5	7	9	3.03	842/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.03	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	187/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 257  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	0	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	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 258  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	0	3	0	9	16	13	3.88	1295/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	3	11	13	11	3.77	1340/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	6	12	12	10	3.65	1153/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	3	7	16	2	3.61	1372/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	2	0	9	9	9	3.79	1026/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	1	6	9	4	3.43	1303/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	9	14	15	3.98	1074/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	945/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	2	7	15	2	3.65	1268/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	6	5	16	4.29	1096/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	2	4	11	15	4.22	1412/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	2	8	12	9	3.81	1267/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	6	8	12	4.07	1088/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	1	4	6	3	9	3.65	976/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	9	3	10	7	7	3.00	1254/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	4	9	7	14	3.68	1142/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	4	10	10	8	3.39	1212/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	11	2	5	7	9	3.03	842/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.03	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	187/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 258  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	0	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	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 259  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	0	3	0	9	16	13	3.88	1295/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	3	11	13	11	3.77	1340/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	6	12	12	10	3.65	1153/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	3	7	16	2	3.61	1372/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	2	0	9	9	9	3.79	1026/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	1	6	9	4	3.43	1303/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	9	14	15	3.98	1074/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	945/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	2	3	17	4	3.88	1078/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	5	5	17	4.36	1031/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	7	7	19	4.36	1346/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	2	6	13	10	4.00	1127/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	6	8	13	4.10	1075/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	4	1	4	6	3	9	3.65	976/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	9	3	10	7	7	3.00	1254/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	4	9	7	14	3.68	1142/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	4	10	10	8	3.39	1212/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	11	2	5	7	9	3.03	842/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.03	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	187/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 259  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	0	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	22				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 260  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	17	21	3.96	1218/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	9	23	15	3.85	1271/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	6	13	18	9	3.26	1281/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	9	14	12	3.85	1236/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	11	10	18	3.80	1017/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	8	11	7	3.85	1055/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	8	15	11	20	3.80	1246/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	44	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	3	13	19	7	3.71	1225/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	10	39	4.66	636/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	7	42	4.69	1046/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	6	9	15	22	3.91	1219/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	10	12	25	4.02	1116/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	7	4	11	11	19	3.60	1006/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	16	6	18	3.44	1105/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	5	11	11	18	3.59	1183/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	10	6	9	7	18	3.34	1225/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	9	8	7	14	3.32	784/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	6	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	6	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	4	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	0	4	0	1	2.50	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	4	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	4	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 260  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	37				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 261  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	17	21	3.96	1218/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	9	23	15	3.85	1271/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	6	13	18	9	3.26	1281/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	9	14	12	3.85	1236/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	11	10	18	3.80	1017/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	8	11	7	3.85	1055/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	8	15	11	20	3.80	1246/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	44	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	3	6	18	10	2	3.05	1496/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	4	9	24	4.45	930/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	2	6	6	26	4.32	1377/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	3	12	11	11	3.74	1306/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	2	5	9	6	15	3.73	1295/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	13	2	4	5	11	2.97	1230/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	16	6	18	3.44	1105/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	5	11	11	18	3.59	1183/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	10	6	9	7	18	3.34	1225/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	9	8	7	14	3.32	784/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	6	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	6	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	4	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	0	4	0	1	2.50	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	4	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	4	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 261  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	37				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 262  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	17	21	3.96	1218/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	9	23	15	3.85	1271/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	6	13	18	9	3.26	1281/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	9	14	12	3.85	1236/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	11	10	18	3.80	1017/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	8	11	7	3.85	1055/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	8	15	11	20	3.80	1246/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	44	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	1	10	20	6	3.84	1123/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	2	1	4	7	16	4.13	1213/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	7	8	21	4.39	1333/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	1	8	9	12	3.97	1163/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	3	5	6	13	3.96	1151/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	5	1	5	3	10	3.50	1049/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	16	6	18	3.44	1105/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	5	11	11	18	3.59	1183/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	10	6	9	7	18	3.34	1225/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	9	8	7	14	3.32	784/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	6	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	6	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	4	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	0	4	0	1	2.50	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	4	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	4	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 262  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	37				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 263  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	17	21	3.96	1218/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	9	23	15	3.85	1271/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	6	13	18	9	3.26	1281/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	9	14	12	3.85	1236/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	11	10	18	3.80	1017/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	8	11	7	3.85	1055/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	8	15	11	20	3.80	1246/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	44	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	11	18	6	3.81	1151/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	0	6	5	16	4.14	1213/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	1	6	8	19	4.23	1409/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	2	8	7	13	3.94	1191/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	3	6	6	12	3.89	1201/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	6	1	5	2	10	3.38	1113/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	16	6	18	3.44	1105/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	5	11	11	18	3.59	1183/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	10	6	9	7	18	3.34	1225/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	9	8	7	14	3.32	784/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	6	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	6	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	4	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	0	4	0	1	2.50	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	4	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	4	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 263  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	37				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 264  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	3	16	25	15	3.74	1381/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	28	9	3.48	1490/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	12	17	16	8	3.07	1323/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	6	15	22	6	3.42	1435/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	9	21	13	13	3.49	1255/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.49	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	8	4	13	10	3	2.89	1460/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	13	19	21	3.82	1234/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	12	47	4.75	913/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	2	1	10	23	11	3.85	1105/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	7	10	41	4.43	956/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	9	9	41	4.43	1305/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	13	23	19	3.85	1246/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	13	17	26	4.00	1121/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	6	5	7	20	20	3.74	921/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	9	12	19	12	3.30	1175/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	16	24	15	3.78	1080/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	2	17	22	13	3.61	1140/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	7	5	13	15	14	3.44	727/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	11	2	1	8	1	3	3.13	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	6	1	6	4	2	2.74	229/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.74	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	6	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	6	1	1	7	3	2	3.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	11	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	9	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	10	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	10	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	8	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	7	0	6	2	1	2.38	46/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	2.38	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	6	1	6	3	1	2.53	47/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	2.53	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	7	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	8	0	1	7	0	1	3.11	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	8	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	3	6	6	3	3.05	48/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	3.05	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	3	0	2	8	5	4	3.58	24/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	3.58	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	5	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	36/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	3.56	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	5	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	20/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	3.76	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	103/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	3.24	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 264  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 265  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	3	16	25	15	3.74	1381/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	28	9	3.48	1490/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	12	17	16	8	3.07	1323/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	6	15	22	6	3.42	1435/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	9	21	13	13	3.49	1255/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.49	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	8	4	13	10	3	2.89	1460/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	13	19	21	3.82	1234/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	12	47	4.75	913/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	4	7	16	11	3	3.05	1497/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	2	5	9	12	23	3.96	1306/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	2	8	15	25	4.20	1419/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	7	8	9	17	9	3.26	1457/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	7	6	10	15	11	3.35	1422/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	7	4	12	14	9	3.30	1143/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	9	12	19	12	3.30	1175/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	16	24	15	3.78	1080/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	2	17	22	13	3.61	1140/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	7	5	13	15	14	3.44	727/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	11	2	1	8	1	3	3.13	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	6	1	6	4	2	2.74	229/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.74	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	6	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	6	1	1	7	3	2	3.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	11	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	9	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	10	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	10	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	8	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	7	0	6	2	1	2.38	46/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	2.38	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	6	1	6	3	1	2.53	47/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	2.53	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	7	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	8	0	1	7	0	1	3.11	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	8	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	3	6	6	3	3.05	48/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	3.05	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	3	0	2	8	5	4	3.58	24/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	3.58	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	5	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	36/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	3.56	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	5	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	20/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	3.76	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	103/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	3.24	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 265  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 266  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	3	16	25	15	3.74	1381/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	28	9	3.48	1490/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	12	17	16	8	3.07	1323/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	6	15	22	6	3.42	1435/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	9	21	13	13	3.49	1255/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.49	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	8	4	13	10	3	2.89	1460/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	13	19	21	3.82	1234/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	12	47	4.75	913/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	0	1	5	16	17	4.26	687/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	5	9	31	4.45	930/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	1	12	33	4.62	1133/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	2	3	3	12	26	4.24	960/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	8	12	24	4.31	921/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	8	4	2	5	11	17	3.90	824/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	9	12	19	12	3.30	1175/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	16	24	15	3.78	1080/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	2	17	22	13	3.61	1140/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	7	5	13	15	14	3.44	727/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	11	2	1	8	1	3	3.13	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	6	1	6	4	2	2.74	229/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.74	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	6	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	6	1	1	7	3	2	3.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	11	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	9	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	10	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	10	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	8	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	7	0	6	2	1	2.38	46/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	2.38	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	6	1	6	3	1	2.53	47/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	2.53	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	7	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	8	0	1	7	0	1	3.11	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	8	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	3	6	6	3	3.05	48/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	3.05	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	3	0	2	8	5	4	3.58	24/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	3.58	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	5	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	36/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	3.56	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	5	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	20/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	3.76	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	103/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	3.24	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 266  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 267  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	3	16	25	15	3.74	1381/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	28	9	3.48	1490/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	12	17	16	8	3.07	1323/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	6	15	22	6	3.42	1435/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	9	21	13	13	3.49	1255/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.49	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	8	4	13	10	3	2.89	1460/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	13	19	21	3.82	1234/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	12	47	4.75	913/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	0	0	8	18	13	4.13	835/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	4	10	31	4.47	904/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	1	14	31	4.57	1174/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	2	2	4	15	23	4.20	1001/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	8	15	21	4.24	973/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	8	5	2	6	11	15	3.74	921/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	9	12	19	12	3.30	1175/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	16	24	15	3.78	1080/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	2	17	22	13	3.61	1140/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	7	5	13	15	14	3.44	727/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	11	2	1	8	1	3	3.13	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	6	1	6	4	2	2.74	229/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.74	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	6	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	6	1	1	7	3	2	3.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	11	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	9	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	10	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	10	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	8	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	7	0	6	2	1	2.38	46/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	2.38	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	6	1	6	3	1	2.53	47/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	2.53	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	7	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	8	0	1	7	0	1	3.11	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	8	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	3	6	6	3	3.05	48/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	3.05	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	3	0	2	8	5	4	3.58	24/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	3.58	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	5	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	36/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	3.56	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	5	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	20/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	3.76	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	103/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	3.24	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 267  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 268  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	0	1	3	9	28	15	3.95	1236/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	5	15	23	12	3.71	1375/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	4	9	11	18	13	3.49	1211/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	15	4	5	14	11	5	3.21	1499/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	6	3	13	14	13	3.51	1242/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.51	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	26	3	1	8	9	6	3.52	1259/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	4	14	8	24	3.92	1149/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	8	41	4.70	1004/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	0	1	10	17	8	3.89	1078/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	4	9	37	4.61	731/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	4	6	41	4.73	985/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	4	5	18	24	4.22	981/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	3	8	11	29	4.29	938/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	2	10	11	23	4.06	655/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	6	11	20	9	3.70	997/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	6	9	17	14	3.85	1053/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	10	18	10	3.57	1158/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	3	8	13	7	13	3.43	731/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 268  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 7	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 61 Non-major 61
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	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		
			? 1	Other 25	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 269  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	0	1	3	9	28	15	3.95	1236/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	5	15	23	12	3.71	1375/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	4	9	11	18	13	3.49	1211/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	15	4	5	14	11	5	3.21	1499/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	6	3	13	14	13	3.51	1242/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.51	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	26	3	1	8	9	6	3.52	1259/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	4	14	8	24	3.92	1149/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	8	41	4.70	1004/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	4	7	14	5	3	2.88	1541/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	1	3	4	10	15	4.06	1252/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	3	1	5	7	20	4.11	1445/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	4	1	12	7	10	3.53	1382/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	4	8	9	10	3.64	1333/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	6	2	3	9	5	10	3.62	991/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	6	11	20	9	3.70	997/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	6	9	17	14	3.85	1053/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	10	18	10	3.57	1158/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	3	8	13	7	13	3.43	731/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 269  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	25				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 270  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	0	1	3	9	28	15	3.95	1236/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	5	15	23	12	3.71	1375/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	4	9	11	18	13	3.49	1211/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	15	4	5	14	11	5	3.21	1499/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	6	3	13	14	13	3.51	1242/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.51	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	26	3	1	8	9	6	3.52	1259/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	4	14	8	24	3.92	1149/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	8	41	4.70	1004/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	0	0	0	2	14	15	4.42	497/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	2	0	0	5	21	4.54	815/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	790/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	326/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	1	1	6	20	4.48	722/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	5	1	2	3	2	16	4.25	515/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	6	11	20	9	3.70	997/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	6	9	17	14	3.85	1053/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	10	18	10	3.57	1158/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	3	8	13	7	13	3.43	731/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 270  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	25				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 271  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	0	1	3	9	28	15	3.95	1236/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	5	15	23	12	3.71	1375/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	4	9	11	18	13	3.49	1211/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	15	4	5	14	11	5	3.21	1499/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	6	3	13	14	13	3.51	1242/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.51	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	26	3	1	8	9	6	3.52	1259/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	4	14	8	24	3.92	1149/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	8	41	4.70	1004/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	0	0	1	0	18	12	4.32	607/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	2	0	0	5	21	4.54	815/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	0	7	26	4.71	1022/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	1	0	6	23	4.70	434/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	1	2	4	21	4.48	722/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	6	0	2	3	3	15	4.35	448/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	6	11	20	9	3.70	997/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	6	9	17	14	3.85	1053/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	10	18	10	3.57	1158/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	3	8	13	7	13	3.43	731/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 271  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	25				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 272  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	15	17	14	3.70	1408/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	15	22	13	3.78	1333/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	12	21	9	3.50	1208/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	2	5	8	17	5	3.49	1406/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.49	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	3	7	13	12	3.48	1269/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	4	0	10	7	4	3.28	1363/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	8	13	24	4.00	1029/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	43	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	1	8	26	8	3.89	1078/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	8	39	4.62	715/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	11	35	4.57	1184/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	2	9	15	20	4.02	1118/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	6	9	10	26	4.10	1079/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	3	5	6	14	19	3.87	836/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	11	17	16	3.76	959/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	6	8	11	20	3.70	1128/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	13	13	14	3.58	1150/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	4	5	10	12	16	3.66	651/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.66	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 272  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 273  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	15	17	14	3.70	1408/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	15	22	13	3.78	1333/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	12	21	9	3.50	1208/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	2	5	8	17	5	3.49	1406/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.49	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	3	7	13	12	3.48	1269/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	4	0	10	7	4	3.28	1363/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	8	13	24	4.00	1029/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	43	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	3	5	14	18	2	3.26	1449/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	8	5	26	4.40	983/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	3	6	9	21	4.23	1406/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	2	12	10	12	3.81	1267/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	5	7	8	5	15	3.45	1389/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	3	5	5	7	5	14	3.50	1049/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	11	17	16	3.76	959/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	6	8	11	20	3.70	1128/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	13	13	14	3.58	1150/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	4	5	10	12	16	3.66	651/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.66	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 273  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 274  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	15	17	14	3.70	1408/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	15	22	13	3.78	1333/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	12	21	9	3.50	1208/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	2	5	8	17	5	3.49	1406/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.49	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	3	7	13	12	3.48	1269/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	4	0	10	7	4	3.28	1363/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	8	13	24	4.00	1029/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	43	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	0	10	22	6	3.89	1069/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	4	6	24	4.59	755/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	3	13	20	4.41	1321/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	1	0	4	14	14	4.21	981/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	3	8	10	13	3.89	1206/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	6	3	1	7	4	13	3.82	866/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	11	17	16	3.76	959/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	6	8	11	20	3.70	1128/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	13	13	14	3.58	1150/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	4	5	10	12	16	3.66	651/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.66	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 274  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 275  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	15	17	14	3.70	1408/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	15	22	13	3.78	1333/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	12	21	9	3.50	1208/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	2	5	8	17	5	3.49	1406/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.49	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	3	7	13	12	3.48	1269/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	4	0	10	7	4	3.28	1363/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	8	13	24	4.00	1029/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	43	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	2	7	22	8	3.92	1030/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	4	6	22	4.48	878/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	2	2	13	19	4.36	1346/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	1	0	4	14	14	4.21	981/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	2	9	10	13	3.91	1189/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	6	2	2	8	4	12	3.79	893/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	11	17	16	3.76	959/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	6	8	11	20	3.70	1128/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	13	13	14	3.58	1150/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	4	5	10	12	16	3.66	651/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.66	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 275  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 276  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	13	15	18	3.66	1429/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	6	16	19	10	3.45	1504/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	8	11	18	10	6	2.91	1342/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	2.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	5	9	15	11	2	2.90	1554/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	10	8	19	9	3.43	1303/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	6	12	6	3	3.00	1428/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	5	9	10	11	15	3.44	1415/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	1	0	1	5	42	4.78	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	3	3	9	18	4	3.46	1375/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	8	13	29	4.31	1080/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	3	5	16	26	4.24	1406/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	4	9	11	13	12	3.41	1427/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	2	5	3	6	16	19	3.84	1231/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	5	5	9	11	16	3.61	1002/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	5	12	15	11	3.36	1143/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	5	13	7	19	3.56	1191/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	7	3	14	14	8	3.28	1244/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	9	3	7	7	13	3.31	789/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	3	1	3	0	2	2.67	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	3	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 276  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 58 Non-major 58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 277  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	13	15	18	3.66	1429/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	6	16	19	10	3.45	1504/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	8	11	18	10	6	2.91	1342/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	2.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	5	9	15	11	2	2.90	1554/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	10	8	19	9	3.43	1303/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	6	12	6	3	3.00	1428/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	5	9	10	11	15	3.44	1415/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	1	0	1	5	42	4.78	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	1	2	3	10	12	2	3.31	1436/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	2	2	7	11	18	4.03	1270/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	2	1	7	10	23	4.19	1422/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	3	3	9	15	8	3.58	1368/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	2	6	1	9	12	10	3.50	1370/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	5	3	6	6	15	7	3.46	1075/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	5	12	15	11	3.36	1143/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	5	13	7	19	3.56	1191/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	7	3	14	14	8	3.28	1244/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	9	3	7	7	13	3.31	789/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	3	1	3	0	2	2.67	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	3	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 277  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 58 Non-major 58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 278  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	13	15	18	3.66	1429/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	6	16	19	10	3.45	1504/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	8	11	18	10	6	2.91	1342/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	2.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	5	9	15	11	2	2.90	1554/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	10	8	19	9	3.43	1303/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	6	12	6	3	3.00	1428/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	5	9	10	11	15	3.44	1415/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	1	0	1	5	42	4.78	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	2	1	3	12	9	4	3.41	1399/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	6	0	7	9	11	3.58	1446/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	3	1	7	13	13	3.86	1500/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	6	1	5	12	10	3.56	1374/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	3	2	2	8	9	10	3.74	1283/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	11	3	3	6	6	4	3.23	1170/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	5	12	15	11	3.36	1143/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	5	13	7	19	3.56	1191/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	7	3	14	14	8	3.28	1244/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	9	3	7	7	13	3.31	789/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	3	1	3	0	2	2.67	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	3	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 278  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 279  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	13	15	18	3.66	1429/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	6	16	19	10	3.45	1504/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	8	11	18	10	6	2.91	1342/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	2.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	5	9	15	11	2	2.90	1554/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	10	8	19	9	3.43	1303/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	6	12	6	3	3.00	1428/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	5	9	10	11	15	3.44	1415/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	1	0	1	5	42	4.78	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	2	2	2	8	13	4	3.52	1340/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	4	0	7	10	12	3.79	1391/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	0	6	11	19	4.27	1393/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	2	1	7	13	11	3.88	1229/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	1	10	9	12	3.91	1197/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	10	3	3	6	6	5	3.30	1143/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	5	12	15	11	3.36	1143/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	5	13	7	19	3.56	1191/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	7	3	14	14	8	3.28	1244/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	9	3	7	7	13	3.31	789/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	3	1	3	0	2	2.67	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	3	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 279  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 58 Non-major 58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 1		



Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 280  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	1	4	6	4.25	965/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	897/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1176/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1335/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1395/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	782/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	442/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	220/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	511/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	1031/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	432/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	2.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1192/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	887/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	922/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	789/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 280  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 281  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	1	4	6	4.25	965/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	897/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1176/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1335/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1395/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	782/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	1	5	1	0	2.75	1561/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	930/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	1463/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	3	0	2	2.78	1529/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	0	3	2	3.00	1479/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1287/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	2.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1192/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	887/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	922/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	789/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 281  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 282  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	1	4	6	4.25	965/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	897/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1176/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1335/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1395/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	782/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	1	1	5	0	3.25	1451/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1446/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1517/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1485/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	1506/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1316/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	2.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1192/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	887/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	922/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	789/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 282  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 283  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	1	4	6	4.25	965/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	897/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1176/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1335/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1395/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	782/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	1	2	4	0	3.13	1483/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1506/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1551/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	1532/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	0	2	1	2.50	1528/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1346/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	2.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1192/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	887/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	922/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	789/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 283  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 284  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	4.56	577/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1245/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	890/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1200/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	720/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.12	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	303/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1060/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	667/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 285  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	4.56	577/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1245/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	890/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1200/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	1571/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	731/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1321/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.12	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1532/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1344/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1270/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1060/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	667/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 286  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	4.56	577/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1245/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	890/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1200/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1225/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1121/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1529/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.12	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1472/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1479/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1060/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	667/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 287  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	4.56	577/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1245/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	890/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1200/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	852/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1529/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.12	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1472/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1408/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1060/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	667/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 288  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	3	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1127/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1435/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1385/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	968/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	913/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1440/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	1	3	9	3.88	1354/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	0	3	11	4.29	1387/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	1	5	7	3.71	1321/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	8	7	4.06	1098/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	4	2	2	4	1	2.69	1284/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	1169/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	875/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1006/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	555/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 288  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 289  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	3	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1127/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1435/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1385/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	968/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	913/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	588/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	851/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	690/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	1169/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	875/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1006/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	555/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 289  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 290  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	3	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1127/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1435/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1385/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	968/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	913/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	636/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1034/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	342/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1060/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	457/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	1169/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	875/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1006/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	555/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 290  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 291  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	3	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1127/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1435/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1385/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	968/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	913/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	0	6	1	3.56	1323/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	791/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1146/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	524/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1211/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	457/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	1169/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	875/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1006/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	555/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 291  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 292  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	1	1	7	14	15	4.08	1136/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	9	11	16	4.05	1094/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	862/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	2	7	9	9	3.93	1175/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	11	9	10	3.87	945/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1113/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	8	18	4.23	849/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	897/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	0	9	7	10	3.93	1030/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	1	7	26	4.63	699/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	7	28	4.75	931/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	4	12	19	4.36	822/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	11	20	4.33	901/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	2	3	6	11	10	3.75	914/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	5	5	7	12	3.55	1064/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	9	11	3.79	1080/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	6	6	7	11	3.52	1177/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	7	3	4	4	11	3.31	784/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 292  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 293  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	1	1	7	14	15	4.08	1136/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	9	11	16	4.05	1094/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	862/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	2	7	9	9	3.93	1175/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	11	9	10	3.87	945/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1113/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	8	18	4.23	849/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	897/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	2	3	7	10	3	3.36	1419/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	3	5	16	4.31	1080/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	2	6	17	4.46	1273/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	2	1	9	3	11	3.77	1292/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	3	5	6	10	3.84	1226/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	3	2	7	3	7	3.41	1101/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	5	5	7	12	3.55	1064/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	9	11	3.79	1080/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	6	6	7	11	3.52	1177/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	7	3	4	4	11	3.31	784/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 293  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 294  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	1	1	7	14	15	4.08	1136/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	9	11	16	4.05	1094/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	862/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	2	7	9	9	3.93	1175/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	11	9	10	3.87	945/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1113/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	8	18	4.23	849/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	897/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	5	0	0	5	12	3	3.90	1060/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	1050/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	1313/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	812/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	841/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	4	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	582/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	5	5	7	12	3.55	1064/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	9	11	3.79	1080/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	6	6	7	11	3.52	1177/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	7	3	4	4	11	3.31	784/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 294  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 295  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	1	1	7	14	15	4.08	1136/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	9	11	16	4.05	1094/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	862/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	2	7	9	9	3.93	1175/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	11	9	10	3.87	945/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1113/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	8	18	4.23	849/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	897/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	1060/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	1	2	7	13	4.25	1121/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	1	1	7	14	4.33	1365/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	4	5	14	4.29	897/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	763/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	528/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	5	5	7	12	3.55	1064/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	9	11	3.79	1080/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	6	6	7	11	3.52	1177/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	7	3	4	4	11	3.31	784/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 295  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 296  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	10	8	3.61	1471/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	11	12	8	3.84	1279/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	10	10	7	3.53	1196/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	2	10	5	3	3.45	1421/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	10	9	6	3.52	1242/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	2	7	7	2	3.50	1266/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	13	9	3.94	1134/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	465/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	6	12	3	3.86	1105/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	12	13	4.23	1145/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	1165/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	2	13	11	4.07	1100/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	5	8	12	4.04	1107/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	4	2	5	6	6	3.35	1126/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	1	13	2	3	2.80	1314/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	12	6	4	3.36	1243/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	11	3	4	3.00	1286/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	5	2	5	1	7	3.15	823/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 33
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	18

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 297  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	10	8	3.61	1471/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	11	12	8	3.84	1279/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	10	10	7	3.53	1196/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	2	10	5	3	3.45	1421/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	10	9	6	3.52	1242/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	2	7	7	2	3.50	1266/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	13	9	3.94	1134/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	465/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	1	15	3	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	5	10	9	4.08	1243/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	1155/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	8	5	7	3.73	1311/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	2	8	4	5	3.50	1370/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	4	2	3	5	4	3.17	1189/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	1	13	2	3	2.80	1314/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	12	6	4	3.36	1243/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	11	3	4	3.00	1286/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	5	2	5	1	7	3.15	823/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	0	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 298  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	10	8	3.61	1471/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	11	12	8	3.84	1279/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	10	10	7	3.53	1196/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	2	10	5	3	3.45	1421/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	10	9	6	3.52	1242/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	2	7	7	2	3.50	1266/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	13	9	3.94	1134/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	465/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	12	11	4.48	415/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	852/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	1003/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	651/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	832/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	1034/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	1	13	2	3	2.80	1314/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	12	6	4	3.36	1243/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	11	3	4	3.00	1286/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	5	2	5	1	7	3.15	823/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 33
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	18

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 299  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	10	8	3.61	1471/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	11	12	8	3.84	1279/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	10	10	7	3.53	1196/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	2	10	5	3	3.45	1421/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	10	9	6	3.52	1242/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	2	7	7	2	3.50	1266/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	13	9	3.94	1134/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	465/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	2	11	8	0	3.29	1444/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1319/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	1396/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	2	7	4	5	3.67	1336/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	4	2	6	5	3.71	1308/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	2	3	1	3	3	3.17	1189/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	1	13	2	3	2.80	1314/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	12	6	4	3.36	1243/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	11	3	4	3.00	1286/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	5	2	5	1	7	3.15	823/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 33
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	18



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 300  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	8	8	3.81	1343/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	10	4.15	1010/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	10	8	3.88	1044/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	2	8	6	3.75	1285/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	8	3.74	1074/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1214/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	883/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	765/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	288/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	930/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	1096/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	651/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	695/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	6	4	11	4.14	607/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	5	4	3.11	1244/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	6	2	8	3.83	1057/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	4	2	4	5	3.22	1260/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	634/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	377/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 300  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 301  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	8	8	3.81	1343/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	10	4.15	1010/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	10	8	3.88	1044/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	2	8	6	3.75	1285/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	8	3.74	1074/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1214/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	883/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	765/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	4	1	9	5	1	2.90	1535/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	2	2	6	9	3.73	1411/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	1419/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	2	2	6	7	3.60	1360/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	3	1	5	6	4	3.37	1417/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	4	1	4	5	5	3.32	1138/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	5	4	3.11	1244/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	6	2	8	3.83	1057/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	4	2	4	5	3.22	1260/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	634/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	377/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 301  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 302  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	8	8	3.81	1343/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	10	4.15	1010/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	10	8	3.88	1044/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	2	8	6	3.75	1285/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	8	3.74	1074/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1214/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	883/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	765/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	4	9	3	3.76	1184/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1326/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	1409/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	1127/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	1221/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	860/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	5	4	3.11	1244/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	6	2	8	3.83	1057/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	4	2	4	5	3.22	1260/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	634/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.69
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	377/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 302  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 303  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	8	8	3.81	1343/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	10	4.15	1010/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	10	8	3.88	1044/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	2	8	6	3.75	1285/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	8	3.74	1074/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1214/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	883/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	765/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	5	7	4	3.76	1184/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1326/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	1409/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1273/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	6	2	4	3.43	1400/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	996/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	5	4	3.11	1244/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	6	2	8	3.83	1057/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	4	2	4	5	3.22	1260/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	634/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	377/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 303  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 304  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	5	4.07	1142/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	521/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	823/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1027/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	614/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	302/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	635/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1332/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1031/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1096/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1096/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1088/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	792/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	616/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	948/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	118/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	65/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	82/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	63/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.70	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	338/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 304  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MESSENGER, TASH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 305  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1142/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	521/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	823/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1027/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	614/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	302/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	635/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	535/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	683/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	985/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	511/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	586/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	690/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	616/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	948/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	118/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	65/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	82/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	63/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.70	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	338/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MESSENGER, TASH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 305  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0201  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 306  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	3	3	3.67	1429/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	797/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1071/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	815/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	465/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1387/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	1340/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1175/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	1050/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1365/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1127/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1206/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1025/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1081/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1275/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1346/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	58/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	282/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	7

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0201  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 307  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1429/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	797/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1071/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	815/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	465/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1387/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	1340/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	687/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1401/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1498/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1235/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1336/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1090/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1081/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1275/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1346/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	58/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	282/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 308  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	1	5	6	2	3.31	1545/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	4	3.75	1347/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	882/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	1323/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	703/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1062/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	4	4	2	3.23	1489/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	977/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1261/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1169/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1146/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	1001/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1121/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	607/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	948/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	2	2	7	3.79	1080/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1181/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	249/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	166/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	152/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	149/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.08	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	148/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.08	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	442/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	190/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	3.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 308  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFFREY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 309  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	1	5	6	2	3.31	1545/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	4	3.75	1347/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	882/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	1323/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	703/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1062/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	4	4	2	3.23	1489/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	977/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	374/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1248/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	5	0	8	4.07	1453/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	1046/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	1	2	7	3.79	1258/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	644/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	948/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	2	2	7	3.79	1080/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1181/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	249/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	166/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	152/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	149/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.08	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	148/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.08	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	442/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	190/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	3.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFFREY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 309  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 310  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	2	0	3	4.20	1027/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1313/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1243/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1499/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1065/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1089/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1387/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1440/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	731/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1146/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	780/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1121/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	690/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	795/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	946/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	948/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.50	

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 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 6
84-150	2	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 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: NGUYEN, DUONG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 311  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1027/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1313/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1243/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1499/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1065/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1089/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1387/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1440/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1451/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1515/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1556/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1472/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1408/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	795/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	946/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	948/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0501  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 312  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	1	8	5	3	3.44	1513/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1112/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1430/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	8	1	6	3.69	1126/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	8	2	4	3.71	1143/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	1	5	6	3.39	1442/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	697/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	4	10	1	3.44	1381/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1257/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	1241/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	3	1	10	4.19	1010/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	3	2	7	3.69	1315/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	836/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1122/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1069/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1206/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	64/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	91/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	149/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.08	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	72/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	381/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.08	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0501  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 312  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0501  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 313  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	1	8	5	3	3.44	1513/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1112/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1430/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	8	1	6	3.69	1126/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	8	2	4	3.71	1143/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	1	5	6	3.39	1442/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	697/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	11	2	3.88	1087/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1080/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1419/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	780/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1206/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	495/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1122/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1069/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1206/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	64/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	91/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	149/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.08	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	72/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	381/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.08	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0501  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 313  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 314  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	7	7	3	3.40	1524/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	7	5	6	3.65	1415/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1196/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	3	5	4	6	3.72	1300/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	935/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	8	6	4	3.68	1159/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	7	5	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	765/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	7	7	2	3.59	1310/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	3	8	5	3.79	1391/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	1346/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	8	4	3.68	1328/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	5	5	3	3.35	1420/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	842/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1113/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1265/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1276/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 314  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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 102L 0601  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 315  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	1	7	7	3	3.40	1524/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	7	5	6	3.65	1415/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1196/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	3	5	4	6	3.72	1300/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	935/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	8	6	4	3.68	1159/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	7	5	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	765/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	1319/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1252/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	1439/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1368/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1277/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	534/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1113/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1265/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1276/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 315  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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 102L 0701  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 316  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1371/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1208/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1236/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1067/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1045/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1191/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1462/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1375/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1279/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1034/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1403/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	1432/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1153/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1011/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1216/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	948/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	129/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	117/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	28/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	45/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	293/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFFREY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 317  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1371/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1208/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1236/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1067/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1045/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1191/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1462/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	1060/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1012/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1463/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	754/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1121/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	914/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1011/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1216/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	948/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	129/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	117/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	28/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	45/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	293/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0801  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 318  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	912/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1010/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	925/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	722/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	986/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	883/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1264/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1191/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	1071/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	939/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1121/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	860/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1081/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1316/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1143/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	431/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	45/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	43/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0801  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MESSENGER, TASH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 319  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	912/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1010/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	925/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	722/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	986/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	883/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1264/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	374/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	535/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	1313/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	390/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	549/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	690/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1081/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1316/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1143/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	431/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	45/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	43/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 320  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	2	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1254/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1071/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1295/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	885/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	849/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1308/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	4	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1385/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1212/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	2	5	3.67	1336/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1362/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	6	1	2	3.18	1183/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	5	2	3.33	1159/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	6	1	2	3.00	1316/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	4	2	1	2.67	1339/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	163/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	121/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	130/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	146/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	438/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	3.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 320  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 321  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	2	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1254/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1071/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1295/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	885/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	849/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1308/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1060/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1248/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1384/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	1028/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	851/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1025/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	5	2	3.33	1159/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	6	1	2	3.00	1316/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	4	2	1	2.67	1339/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	163/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	121/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	130/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	146/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	438/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	3.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 321  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 322  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	2	3	3.64	1450/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1304/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1208/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	1	2	3.27	1487/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1159/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1186/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1480/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1381/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1347/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1422/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1219/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	1359/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	942/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	937/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	831/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	645/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	188/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	188/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	186/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	388/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.00	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: NGUYEN, DUONG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 323  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	2	3	3.64	1450/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1304/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1208/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	1	2	3.27	1487/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1159/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1186/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1480/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1401/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1442/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1352/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1277/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1177/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	937/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	831/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	645/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	188/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	188/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	186/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	388/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 123 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON  
 Enrollment: 88  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 324  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	12	22	4.45	723/1649	4.45	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	26	4.55	498/1648	4.55	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	12	21	4.34	723/1375	4.34	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	451/1595	4.55	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	4	2	6	15	4.07	768/1533	4.07	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	8	28	4.66	333/1623	4.66	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	865/1646	4.78	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	13	18	4.44	456/1621	4.44	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	876/1572	4.78	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	28	4.73	390/1564	4.73	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	4	31	4.81	318/1559	4.81	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	3	1	5	3	5	3.35	1122/1352	3.35	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	520/1384	4.43	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	749/1382	4.37	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	449/1368	4.74	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	14	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 17	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 1	Under-grad	39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	34
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 325  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	9	4.05	1156/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1464/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	7	1	7	3.40	1243/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	462/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1362/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	6	4	3.45	1410/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	9	5	3	3.50	1345/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	1205/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1133/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	2	11	4	3.57	1368/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	0	2	5	9	3.75	1277/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	2	1	1	8	3.79	893/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	57/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	65/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	34/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	121/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	388/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 325  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 326  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	9	4.05	1156/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1464/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	7	1	7	3.40	1243/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	462/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1362/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	6	4	3.45	1410/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	8	4	3.89	1078/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	815/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1384/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	887/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1231/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	57/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	65/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	34/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	121/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	388/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 326  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 327  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	9	4.05	1156/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1464/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	7	1	7	3.40	1243/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	462/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1362/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	6	4	3.45	1410/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	914/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1243/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	1406/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1127/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1322/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	57/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	65/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	34/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	121/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	388/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 327  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 328  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	9	4.05	1156/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1464/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	7	1	7	3.40	1243/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	462/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1362/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	6	4	3.45	1410/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	777/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1050/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	1406/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1028/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1277/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	57/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	65/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	34/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	121/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	388/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 328  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 329  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	4	8	13	4.11	1116/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	8	10	3.89	1237/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	6	7	7	3.39	1245/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1038/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	4	2	7	4	3.50	1249/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	675/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	3	14	3.96	1089/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	27	4.86	748/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	3	7	6	3	3.47	1363/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	3	2	20	4.41	983/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	1071/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	7	4	12	3.85	1246/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	7	3	13	3.92	1181/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	6	1	2	2	11	3.50	1049/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	110/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	128/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	65/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	99/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	1	3	2	11	3.85	438/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.85	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 28	Non-major 25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 23		
				? 3			



Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 330  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	4	8	13	4.11	1116/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	8	10	3.89	1237/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	6	7	7	3.39	1245/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1038/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	4	2	7	4	3.50	1249/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	675/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	3	14	3.96	1089/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	27	4.86	748/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	5	9	5	4.00	914/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	1	2	2	11	4.06	1257/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	1313/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	0	3	3	11	4.11	1083/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	4	3	7	3.71	1308/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	9	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	991/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	110/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	128/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	65/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	99/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	1	3	2	11	3.85	438/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.85	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 28	Non-major 25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 23		
				? 3			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 331  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	4	8	13	4.11	1116/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	8	10	3.89	1237/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	6	7	7	3.39	1245/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1038/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	4	2	7	4	3.50	1249/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	675/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	3	14	3.96	1089/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	27	4.86	748/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	7	9	2	3.63	1281/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	1096/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1400/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	981/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1226/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	110/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	128/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	65/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	99/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	1	3	2	11	3.85	438/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.85	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 25
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	Other 23

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANNING, STEVEN (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 332  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	4	8	13	4.11	1116/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	8	10	3.89	1237/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	6	7	7	3.39	1245/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1038/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	4	2	7	4	3.50	1249/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	675/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	3	14	3.96	1089/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	27	4.86	748/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	7	9	3	3.79	1167/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	1096/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	1297/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1127/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	1	6	3.69	1311/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	110/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	128/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	65/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	99/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	1	3	2	11	3.85	438/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.85	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 25
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	Other 23

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 333  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1450/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	8	3.68	1395/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	9	3.55	1192/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	916/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	1	1	8	3.47	1269/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	0	2	9	4.00	883/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1379/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	2	3	7	3	3.16	1475/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	1	13	4.24	1137/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	1193/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	4	5	6	3.38	1431/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	3	0	8	3.15	1458/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	3	3	1	10	3.60	1002/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	71/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	135/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	62/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.76	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	2	3	1	3	8	3.71	175/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	

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 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 19		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 334  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1450/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	8	3.68	1395/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	9	3.55	1192/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	916/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	1	1	8	3.47	1269/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	0	2	9	4.00	883/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1379/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	5	6	6	3.74	1209/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1205/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1500/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1306/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	3	0	2	6	3.75	1277/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1323/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	71/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	135/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	62/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.76	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	2	3	1	3	8	3.71	175/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	

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
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 7	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Other 19

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 335  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1450/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	8	3.68	1395/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	9	3.55	1192/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	916/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	1	1	8	3.47	1269/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	0	2	9	4.00	883/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1379/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	9	4	4	3.47	1363/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1373/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1435/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1316/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	3	1	1	6	3.67	1322/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1323/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	71/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	135/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	62/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.76	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	2	3	1	3	8	3.71	175/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	

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 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 19		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANNING, STEVEN (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 336  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1450/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	8	3.68	1395/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	9	3.55	1192/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	916/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	1	1	8	3.47	1269/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	0	2	9	4.00	883/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1379/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	8	3	6	3.63	1281/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1420/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1512/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1356/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	4	1	2	5	3.67	1322/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1323/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	71/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	135/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	62/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.76	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	2	3	1	3	8	3.71	175/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	

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 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 19		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 301 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY  
 Enrollment: 82  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 337  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	16	24	4.28	943/1649	4.28	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	18	24	4.30	850/1648	4.30	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	13	28	4.40	665/1375	4.40	3.57	4.27	4.22	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	24	1	0	5	4	13	4.22	865/1595	4.22	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	6	3	11	9	14	3.51	1242/1533	3.51	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.51	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	465/1512	4.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	9	32	4.53	469/1623	4.53	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	1	43	4.93	465/1646	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	3	18	15	4.21	731/1621	4.21	3.64	4.06	4.02	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	37	4.76	480/1568	4.76	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	37	4.82	790/1572	4.82	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	19	22	4.33	854/1564	4.33	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	11	28	4.51	684/1559	4.51	3.79	4.29	4.23	4.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	27	5	1	2	5	5	3.22	1170/1352	3.22	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	42	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	31
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	19	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	2						



Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 338  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	11	9	4.32	898/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	4.36	756/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	853/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	935/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	366/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	4	9	3.91	1180/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	332/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	914/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	461/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	912/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	580/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	4	8	3.85	1221/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	779/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	965/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	851/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	844/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	2	7	9	3.95	143/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.95	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	88/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	156/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	95/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 338  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	7	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 339  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	11	9	4.32	898/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	4.36	756/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	853/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	935/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	366/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	4	9	3.91	1180/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	332/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	914/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1435/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	965/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	851/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	844/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	2	7	9	3.95	143/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.95	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	88/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	156/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	95/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 339  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	7	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 340  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	11	9	4.32	898/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	4.36	756/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	853/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	935/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	366/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	4	9	3.91	1180/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	332/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1030/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1390/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	965/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	851/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	844/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	2	7	9	3.95	143/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.95	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	88/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	156/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	95/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 340  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	7	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, YU (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 341  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	11	9	4.32	898/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	4.36	756/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	853/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	935/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	366/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	4	9	3.91	1180/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	332/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1151/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	965/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	851/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	844/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	2	7	9	3.95	143/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.95	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	88/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	156/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	95/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, YU (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 341  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	7	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	20				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 342  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	8	4	4.14	1076/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1021/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	956/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1200/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	735/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	2	3.57	1359/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1151/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	588/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	912/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1096/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1181/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	860/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1039/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1175/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1143/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	129/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	179/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.85	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	206/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	151/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	420/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 343  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	8	4	4.14	1076/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1021/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	956/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1200/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	735/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	2	3.57	1359/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1039/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1175/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1143/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	129/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	179/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.85	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	206/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	151/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	420/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 344  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	8	4	4.14	1076/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1021/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	956/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1200/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	735/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	2	3.57	1359/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1451/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1529/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1039/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1175/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1143/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	129/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	179/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.85	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	206/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	151/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	420/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, YU (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 345  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	8	4	4.14	1076/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1021/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	956/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1200/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	735/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	2	3.57	1359/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1440/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1556/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1039/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1175/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1143/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	129/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	179/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.85	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	206/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	151/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	420/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 288  
 Questionnaires: 195

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 346  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	0	4	2	22	53	111	4.38	803/1649	4.15	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	11	22	65	94	4.26	885/1648	3.89	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	6	24	65	94	4.27	788/1375	3.90	3.57	4.27	4.22	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	72	7	7	18	33	54	4.01	1067/1595	3.85	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.01	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	2	6	24	47	102	4.33	545/1533	4.32	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	111	8	4	19	20	27	3.69	1154/1512	3.74	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	2	3	24	54	106	4.37	671/1623	4.19	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	1	1	152	35	4.17	1462/1646	4.55	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	2	2	1	12	68	70	4.33	607/1621	3.88	3.64	4.06	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	6	38	145	4.70	573/1568	4.37	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	3	16	171	4.86	690/1572	4.87	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	6	26	63	94	4.28	918/1564	3.76	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	17	44	119	4.41	832/1559	3.90	3.79	4.29	4.23	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	98	16	8	24	16	19	3.17	1189/1352	3.46	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	159	0	6	2	7	11	10	3.47	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	158	0	5	3	11	7	11	3.43	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	159	0	2	1	9	6	18	4.03	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	157	25	0	2	4	0	7	3.92	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	186	4	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	188	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	188	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	188	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	179	2	1	2	2	1	8	3.93	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	192	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	191	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	191	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	189	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	191	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	191	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	191	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	191	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	184	0	0	4	0	5	2	3.45	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	190	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	190	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	190	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	191	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	190	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 288  
 Questionnaires: 195

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 346  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 2	A 43	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 10
28-55	53	1.00-1.99 0	B 65		
56-83	30	2.00-2.99 25	C 47	General 1	Under-grad 194 Non-major 185
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 35	D 5		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 48	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 13	Other 172	

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK  
 Enrollment: 187  
 Questionnaires: 123

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 347  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	10	24	29	50	3.92	1254/1649	4.15	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	5	18	34	35	27	3.51	1477/1648	3.89	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	8	14	37	28	32	3.52	1200/1375	3.90	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	44	5	6	18	23	22	3.69	1323/1595	3.85	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	16	4	2	14	20	60	4.30	575/1533	4.32	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	60	4	3	11	18	18	3.80	1095/1512	3.74	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	3	11	20	31	52	4.01	1029/1623	4.19	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.01
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	0	8	106	4.93	531/1646	4.55	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	8	6	31	41	12	3.44	1387/1621	3.88	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	10	16	40	46	4.04	1265/1568	4.37	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	7	102	4.88	640/1572	4.87	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	13	16	35	27	21	3.24	1462/1564	3.76	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	18	10	23	28	31	3.40	1408/1559	3.90	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	13	11	3	21	22	37	3.76	914/1352	3.46	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	99	0	5	1	5	8	5	3.29	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	100	0	1	3	3	6	10	3.91	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	101	0	3	2	8	4	5	3.27	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	101	1	2	1	3	6	9	3.90	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	120	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	120	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	120	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	115	1	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	122	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	121	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	122	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	120	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	122	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	122	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	120	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK  
 Enrollment: 187  
 Questionnaires: 123

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 347  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 2	Major 10
28-55	29	1.00-1.99 3	B 43				
56-83	22	2.00-2.99 9	C 32	General	2	Under-grad 121	Non-major 113
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 19	D 5				
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 38	F 1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	98		
			? 8				



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 348  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	7	3	2	3.46	1508/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	1	1	2.79	1614/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	2.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	7	2	0	2.69	1358/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	5	2	2	2	2.92	1552/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	7	3	1	3.23	1373/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	4	1	2	2.83	1470/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	7	2	2	3.07	1526/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	2.79	1557/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	6	6	1	0	2.50	1555/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	2.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	6	7	0	1	0	1.71	1572/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	2.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	10	3	0	0	2.14	1556/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	6	2	0	0	1.91	1554/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	164/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	3	1	2	5	3.38	215/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	180/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.85	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	190/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	3	1	3	5	3.62	463/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.62	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: XIE, MIN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 349  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	7	3	2	3.46	1508/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	1	1	2.79	1614/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	2.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	7	2	0	2.69	1358/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	5	2	2	2	2.92	1552/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	7	3	1	3.23	1373/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	4	1	2	2.83	1470/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	7	2	2	3.07	1526/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	9	2	0	2.93	1528/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	7	4	0	2.93	1532/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	2.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1504/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	2.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	6	0	3.31	1448/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	3.00	1479/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	164/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	3	1	2	5	3.38	215/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	180/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.85	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	190/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	3	1	3	5	3.62	463/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.62	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 350  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	644/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	862/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1107/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	663/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1008/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	861/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	9	2	0	2.93	1528/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	6	3	4	1	3.00	1515/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	7	1	3	3.29	1549/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	8	1	1	2.93	1515/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	9	0	1	2.71	1520/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1002/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	708/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1071/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	107/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	142/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	74/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	81/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	428/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 350  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 351  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	644/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	862/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1107/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	663/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1008/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	861/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	146/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	554/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	216/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	11	4.43	804/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	690/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	708/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1071/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	107/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	142/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	74/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	81/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	428/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 351  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0301  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 352  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1415/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	1434/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	4	2	2	3	2.86	1346/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	3	2	0	6	3.38	1452/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	505/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	994/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	7	1	5	3.31	1470/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	6	9	0	0	2.50	1588/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	9	3	0	2.94	1530/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	4	6	1	3	2.94	1563/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	11	0	1	2.88	1521/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	6	0	1	2.31	1539/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	1	1	1	2	2.75	1277/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	118/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	193/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	148/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.10	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	196/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	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	5	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	0	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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0301  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 353  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1415/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	1434/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	4	2	2	3	2.86	1346/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	3	2	0	6	3.38	1452/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	505/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	994/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	7	1	5	3.31	1470/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	10	5	0	3.25	1451/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1431/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	8	2	3.67	1524/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	3	5	3	3.47	1403/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	4	1	2.93	1495/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1330/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	118/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	193/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	148/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.10	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	196/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	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	5	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	0	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	9
			? 0		



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 354  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	3	8	1	3.18	1578/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	7	1	3.18	1575/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	3	5	1	2	3.18	1300/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1389/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	7	5	1	3.19	1392/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	7	2	2	3.07	1420/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1379/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	4	8	2	0	2.53	1585/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	5	3	7	1	3.12	1509/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	3	2	4	4	3.06	1555/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	7	5	3	3.47	1399/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	5	5	1	2.88	1505/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1366/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	210/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	215/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	194/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	180/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	467/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
Enrollment: 17  
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2008

Page 354  
FEB 11, 2009  
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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: HOUPT, JOSH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 355  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	3	8	1	3.18	1578/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	7	1	3.18	1575/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	3	5	1	2	3.18	1300/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1389/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	7	5	1	3.19	1392/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	7	2	2	3.07	1420/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1379/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	4	8	3	3.65	1274/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	8	0	3.40	1481/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	7	4	3	3.53	1535/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1273/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1362/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1366/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	210/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	215/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	194/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	180/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	467/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: HOUP, JOSH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 355  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 356  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1295/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1124/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1150/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1175/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	5	1	3.13	1411/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1320/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	5	6	3.73	1281/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	945/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	8	6	0	0	2.25	1607/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	8	2	4	0	2.50	1555/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	7	4	2	1	2.56	1569/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	7	7	2	0	2.69	1539/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	1	3	0	2.19	1542/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	170/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	193/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	148/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.10	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	164/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	461/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 356  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: YUANYUAN, LIU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 357  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	3.88	1295/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1124/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1150/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1175/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	5	1	3.13	1411/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1320/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	5	6	3.73	1281/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	945/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	1141/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	1012/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	1241/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	1010/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	8	4.00	1121/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	170/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	193/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	148/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.10	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	164/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	461/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: YUANYUAN, LIU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 357  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 358  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1343/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	2	5	3.50	1481/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	1	5	3.27	1278/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	6	1	4	3.36	1463/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1065/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	8	1	4	3.47	1287/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1446/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	5	7	1	0	2.38	1599/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	5	3	3	3.19	1502/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	5	3	3	3.19	1553/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	8	3	1	3.00	1496/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	5	2	2	2.81	1512/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	129/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	100/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	105/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	84/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	293/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 358  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	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	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 359  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1343/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	2	5	3.50	1481/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	1	5	3.27	1278/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	6	1	4	3.36	1463/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1065/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	8	1	4	3.47	1287/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1446/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	3	0	7	5	3.75	1192/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	1096/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1486/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	2	5	5	3.79	1282/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	1258/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	129/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	100/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	105/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	84/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	293/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 359  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	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	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 360  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	898/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1434/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	3	3	2	3	3.08	1322/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	5	3.38	1456/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1006/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	2	5	3.33	1345/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	4	3	3.31	1470/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	816/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	3	8	4	0	2.94	1525/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	4	2	7	3.75	1401/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1483/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	5	5	3	3.50	1388/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	2	7	3.63	1336/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1130/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	164/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	187/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	135/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.23	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	186/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	420/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 361  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	898/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1434/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	3	3	2	3	3.08	1322/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	5	3.38	1456/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1006/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	2	5	3.33	1345/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	4	3	3.31	1470/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	816/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	1	9	2	2	3.06	1494/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	1	4	4	2	2.93	1530/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	8	5	1	3.19	1553/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1485/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	4	3	1	2.71	1520/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1160/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	164/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	187/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	135/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.23	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	186/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	420/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0801  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 362  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1263/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1347/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1252/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	0	6	1	3.27	1487/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	915/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1170/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1410/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	4	5	1	0	2.42	1596/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	3	4	1	3.00	1515/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1556/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1532/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	2.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	1	4	0	2.50	1528/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1375/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	1.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1251/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1356/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	192/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	3	0	3	0	3.00	220/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	205/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	167/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	371/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.17	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
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	5

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0801  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SUNKARA, NARESH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 363  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1263/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1347/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1252/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	0	6	1	3.27	1487/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	915/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1170/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1410/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1345/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	1488/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	1	0	3	4	3.36	1545/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	1	2	4	3.17	1478/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	2.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	0	2	3	3.00	1479/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1375/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	1.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1251/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1356/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	192/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	3	0	3	0	3.00	220/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	205/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	167/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	371/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.17

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
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	5



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0901  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 364  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1351/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	1124/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1138/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1161/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1084/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	0	5	5	3.92	994/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	947/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	731/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1060/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1050/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1212/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	1001/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1216/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1282/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	831/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	654/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	150/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	151/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	458/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.67

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 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	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
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0901  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: XIE, MIN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 365  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1351/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	1124/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1138/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1161/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1084/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	0	5	5	3.92	994/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	947/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	731/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	6	5	0	0	2.33	1603/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	3	3	2	0	2.36	1559/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	4	2	3	1	2.91	1566/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	2	4	0	0	1.91	1562/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	4	2	3	0	0	1.89	1554/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	831/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	654/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	150/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	151/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	458/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.67

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 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	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
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1001  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 366  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	4	3	3.31	1545/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	4	3.69	1395/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	3	5	3	1	2.63	1363/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	4	3	3	1	2.77	1569/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	2.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	8	0	4	3.13	1415/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	3	4	1	2.93	1452/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	2	4	3.25	1485/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	7	6	3	0	2.65	1573/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	8	2	2	3	2.88	1539/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	10	1	3	2	2.81	1568/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	5	6	1	3	3.00	1496/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	6	1	2	2	2.38	1535/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1016/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1159/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	3	1	0	2	3.17	1298/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1129/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	3	0	1	2	3.33	202/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	155/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	180/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	201/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1001  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 367  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	6	4	3	3.31	1545/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	4	4	3.69	1395/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	3	5	3	1	2.63	1363/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	4	3	3	1	2.77	1569/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	2.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	8	0	4	3.13	1415/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	3	4	1	2.93	1452/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	2	4	3.25	1485/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	4	7	3	1	2.94	1525/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	8	1	3.47	1468/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	8	4	2	3.40	1543/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	8	3	2	3.27	1457/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	5	3	1	2.80	1513/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1159/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	3	1	0	2	3.17	1298/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1129/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	3	0	1	2	3.33	202/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	155/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	180/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	201/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1101  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 368  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	3	3	3.67	1429/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	1546/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	2	3.17	1305/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1510/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	2	1	3.00	1441/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1356/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	3	2	3.33	1462/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	7	0	3	2	0	2.00	1610/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	7	0	2	3	3.08	1511/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	3	0	5	3.50	1538/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	5	3	1	3.17	1478/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	0	2	3	2.92	1500/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	201/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	490/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	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	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 369  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	3	3	3.67	1429/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	1546/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	2	3.17	1305/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1510/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	2	1	3.00	1441/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1356/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	3	2	3.33	1462/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	9	1	1	3.17	1473/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	1279/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1463/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1219/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1246/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	201/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	490/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 10
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 6

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 370  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	3	11	4.39	803/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	931/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	1081/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	970/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	740/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	883/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1299/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	7	4	3	1	2.56	1582/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	4	2	7	3.56	1450/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	4	2	8	3.72	1520/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	5	4	3.44	1411/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	1	3	6	3.24	1443/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	99/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	72/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	380/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.10	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	16

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: HOUPT, JOSH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 371  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	3	11	4.39	803/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	931/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	1081/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	970/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	740/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	883/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1299/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	5	3	9	4.06	886/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	1070/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	1241/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	939/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1060/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	99/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	72/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	380/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.10	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	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 351L 1301  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 372  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	4	4.18	1037/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	873/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1112/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	815/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1042/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1180/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	4	2	3	2	0	2.27	1606/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	1	4	3.45	1470/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	1	1	4	3.27	1550/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	1	3	2	3.18	1475/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	1503/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	84/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	121/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	195/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	136/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	371/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.17	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1301  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZIMMERMANN, SAR (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 373  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	4	4.18	1037/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	873/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1112/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	815/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1042/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1180/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	261/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1339/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	342/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	618/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	84/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	121/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	195/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	136/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	371/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.17	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 374  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	1	3	3	3.17	1580/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1617/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	1	1	0	1.91	1373/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	1.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	1583/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	1426/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	6	0	1	2.80	1476/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	3	0	2.83	1567/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	2.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	1	7	0	1	2.58	1579/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	7	2	1	3.00	1515/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	9	0	1	2.83	1568/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	1520/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	1	1	2.58	1524/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1301/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	210/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	225/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	2.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	198/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	482/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

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	6	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 375  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	1	3	3	3.17	1580/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1617/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	1	1	0	1.91	1373/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	1.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	1583/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	1426/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	6	0	1	2.80	1476/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	3	0	2.83	1567/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	2.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	1	4	4	0	2.91	1535/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1470/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1540/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	3	1	3.50	1388/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	4	0	3.00	1479/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	210/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	225/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	2.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	198/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	482/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

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	6	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1501  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 376  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	4.31	912/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1010/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1071/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	815/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1202/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1149/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	5	3	2	2	2.92	1528/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1483/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	4	1	6	3.85	1504/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1403/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	2	3	3	3.00	1479/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1270/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	64/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	105/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	238/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.80	

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
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 1
					Other 10

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1501  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: YUANYUAN, LIU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 377  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	4.31	912/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1010/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1071/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	815/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1202/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1149/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	207/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	480/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	234/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	607/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1277/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	64/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	105/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	238/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.80	

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	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 378  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	0	1	0	0	9	7	4.24	986/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	3	3.88	1245/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	6	1	3.19	1300/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	890/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	3	7	3.75	1065/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1334/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	1	9	3	3.56	1363/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	5	5	4	2	1	2.35	1601/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	1	8	3	3.41	1478/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	1	3	9	3.94	1480/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	6	5	2	3.24	1464/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	3	3	4	3.00	1479/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	114/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	204/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	147/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.11
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	99/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	2	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: WAUCHOPE, ORRET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 379  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	9	7	4.24	986/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	3	3.88	1245/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	6	1	3.19	1300/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	890/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	3	7	3.75	1065/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1334/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	1	9	3	3.56	1363/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	101/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	424/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1003/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	573/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	114/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	204/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	147/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.11	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	99/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	2	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	10



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1701  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 380  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1464/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	2	3.85	1279/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1308/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1490/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1119/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1489/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	765/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1415/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1248/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	1504/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.99	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1292/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	2	3.62	1340/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	0	0	3	0	2.50	1301/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	0	0	6	1	3.20	212/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	199/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	139/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	428/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.90	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1701  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: WAUCHOPE, ORRET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 381  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1464/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	2	3.85	1279/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1308/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1490/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1119/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1489/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	765/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1442/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.99	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	812/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	861/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	0	0	6	1	3.20	212/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	199/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	139/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	428/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.90	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 405 0101  
 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: DANIEL, MARIE-C  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 382  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1303/1649	3.86	3.96	4.28	4.50	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	4	8	7	3.82	1304/1648	3.82	3.88	4.23	4.36	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	5	4	9	3.73	1127/1375	3.73	3.57	4.27	4.48	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	5	7	4	3.45	1283/1533	3.45	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	1009/1623	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16	6	4.27	1384/1646	4.27	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	2	5	8	2	3.20	1463/1621	3.20	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	7	10	4.14	1213/1568	4.14	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	1203/1572	4.55	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	6	6	4	3.23	1467/1564	3.23	3.90	4.28	4.40	3.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	4	5	7	3.41	1408/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.41	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	4	3	3	4	4	3.06	1213/1352	3.06	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 0101  
 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 383  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.25	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.25	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	3.90	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	3.79	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.25	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.73	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.03	4.12	4.61	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.30	4.40	4.57	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.25	4.35	4.63	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.09	4.29	4.41	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.33	4.54	4.66	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.54	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.57	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.50	4.35	4.44	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.83	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	3.25	4.06	4.86	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	25/ 48	4.00	3.02	4.09	4.42	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.59	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	4.38	3.68	3.95	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	3.70	4.30	4.64	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 30	4.00	3.72	4.16	4.24	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.04	4.43	4.84	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.18	4.42	4.85	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	3.82	3.99	4.22	5.00	

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 0101  
 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 383  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 0101  
 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 384  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.25	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.25	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	3.90	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	3.79	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	690/1352	4.25	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.73	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.03	4.12	4.61	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.30	4.40	4.57	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.25	4.35	4.63	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.09	4.29	4.41	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.33	4.54	4.66	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.54	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.57	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.50	4.35	4.44	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.83	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	3.25	4.06	4.86	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	25/ 48	4.00	3.02	4.09	4.42	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.59	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	4.38	3.68	3.95	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	3.70	4.30	4.64	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 30	4.00	3.72	4.16	4.24	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.04	4.43	4.84	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.18	4.42	4.85	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	3.82	3.99	4.22	5.00	

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 0101  
 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 384  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 420 0101  
 Title COMPUTER APPL IN CHEM  
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 385  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	4	4	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	3.96	4.28	4.50	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1218/1648	3.92	3.88	4.23	4.36	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	665/1375	4.40	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1010/1595	4.10	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	1	3	2	3.00	1441/1533	3.00	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	720/1623	4.33	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	3	1	3.36	1485/1568	3.36	4.13	4.43	4.54	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1203/1572	4.55	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1407/1564	3.45	3.90	4.28	4.40	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1344/1559	3.60	3.79	4.29	4.41	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	879/1352	3.80	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		11
Grad.	1	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 432 0101  
 Title ADVANCED BIOCHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: GARCIN, ELSA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 386  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	4.86	230/1649	4.86	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1648	4.71	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	641/1375	4.43	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	417/1595	4.57	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	545/1533	4.33	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.67	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	780/1623	4.29	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	748/1646	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564	4.86	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1559	4.86	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	263/1352	4.57	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.50	3.95	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 173  
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 387  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	10	27	29	4.07	1142/1649	4.07	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	12	18	24	15	3.54	1471/1648	3.54	3.88	4.23	4.36	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	14	16	16	21	3.54	1192/1375	3.54	3.57	4.27	4.48	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	2	9	13	7	17	3.58	1377/1595	3.58	3.74	4.20	4.36	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	1	7	14	18	24	3.89	925/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	0	4	15	19	14	3.83	1075/1512	3.83	3.72	4.10	4.26	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	1	6	20	22	19	3.76	1264/1623	3.76	3.84	4.16	4.27	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	16	54	54	4.77	881/1646	4.77	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	9	18	19	14	3	2.75	1562/1621	3.41	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	9	22	19	17	3.54	1452/1568	4.04	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	3	4	11	19	33	4.07	1453/1572	4.34	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	7	19	15	17	12	3.11	1487/1564	3.73	3.90	4.28	4.40	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	14	9	19	12	16	3.10	1468/1559	3.73	3.79	4.29	4.41	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	9	9	12	15	18	3.38	1109/1352	3.75	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	66	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	66	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	66	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	71	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.41	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	72	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	14	General	3	Under-grad	67	Non-major	66
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	53				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 437 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 173  
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 388  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	10	27	29	4.07	1142/1649	4.07	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	12	18	24	15	3.54	1471/1648	3.54	3.88	4.23	4.36	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	14	16	16	21	3.54	1192/1375	3.54	3.57	4.27	4.48	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	2	9	13	7	17	3.58	1377/1595	3.58	3.74	4.20	4.36	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	1	7	14	18	24	3.89	925/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	0	4	15	19	14	3.83	1075/1512	3.83	3.72	4.10	4.26	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	1	6	20	22	19	3.76	1264/1623	3.76	3.84	4.16	4.27	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	16	54	4.77	881/1646	4.77	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.77		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	11	35	16	4.08	870/1621	3.41	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	7	17	43	4.54	815/1568	4.04	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	19	46	4.62	1133/1572	4.34	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	5	26	34	4.34	854/1564	3.73	3.90	4.28	4.40	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	8	18	39	4.37	871/1559	3.73	3.79	4.29	4.41	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	1	4	9	19	27	4.12	624/1352	3.75	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	66	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	66	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	66	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	71	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.41	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	72	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	14	General	3	Under-grad	67	Non-major	66
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	53				
				?	2						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 389  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	644/1649	4.56	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	427/1648	4.81	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	733/1375	4.55	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	722/1595	4.32	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1310/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	366/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	659/1623	4.54	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	133/1621	4.29	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	273/1568	4.64	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.53	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	326/1564	4.46	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	463/1559	4.52	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	221/1352	4.46	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	23/ 221	4.86	4.14	4.16	4.73	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	16/ 243	4.84	4.03	4.12	4.61	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	36/ 212	4.77	4.30	4.40	4.57	4.87	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	21/ 209	4.88	4.25	4.35	4.63	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	272/ 555	4.83	4.09	4.29	4.41	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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	9	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	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 390  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	644/1649	4.56	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	427/1648	4.81	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	733/1375	4.55	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	722/1595	4.32	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1310/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	366/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	659/1623	4.54	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	914/1621	4.29	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	731/1568	4.64	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1241/1572	4.53	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1564	4.46	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1559	4.52	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1352	4.46	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	23/ 221	4.86	4.14	4.16	4.73	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	16/ 243	4.84	4.03	4.12	4.61	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	36/ 212	4.77	4.30	4.40	4.57	4.87	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	21/ 209	4.88	4.25	4.35	4.63	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	272/ 555	4.83	4.09	4.29	4.41	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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	9	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	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 391  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1649	4.56	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1648	4.81	3.88	4.23	4.36	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	283/1375	4.55	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	759/1595	4.32	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	815/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	436/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	284/1623	4.54	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	94/1621	4.29	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1568	4.64	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	4.53	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1564	4.46	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	4.52	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	91/1352	4.46	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 221	4.86	4.14	4.16	4.73	4.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	35/ 243	4.84	4.03	4.12	4.61	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	86/ 212	4.77	4.30	4.40	4.57	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	40/ 209	4.88	4.25	4.35	4.63	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	4.83	4.09	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 391  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 392  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1649	4.56	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1648	4.81	3.88	4.23	4.36	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	283/1375	4.55	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	759/1595	4.32	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	815/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	436/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	284/1623	4.54	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1375/1621	4.29	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1248/1568	4.64	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	8	1	3.69	1522/1572	4.53	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	5	2	3.62	1356/1564	4.46	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	3	3.85	1226/1559	4.52	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	860/1352	4.46	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 221	4.86	4.14	4.16	4.73	4.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	35/ 243	4.84	4.03	4.12	4.61	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	86/ 212	4.77	4.30	4.40	4.57	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	40/ 209	4.88	4.25	4.35	4.63	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	4.83	4.09	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 392  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 450 0101  
 Title CHEM HETERO COMPDS  
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 393  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	14	4.88	212/1649	4.88	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	414/1648	4.63	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	380/1375	4.69	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	4	7	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	248/1512	4.69	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	164/1623	4.81	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	465/1646	4.94	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1621	5.00	3.64	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	372/1568	4.81	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	118/1564	4.94	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	306/1559	4.81	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352	4.40	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	12	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.41	****	

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 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 451 0101  
 Title MECH OF ORGANIC REACTI  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 394  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	12	4.58	550/1649	4.58	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	599/1648	4.47	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	753/1375	4.32	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	552/1595	4.46	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	1	4	7	3.32	1344/1533	3.32	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	422/1512	4.47	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	502/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1426/1646	4.21	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	348/1621	4.54	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	330/1568	4.84	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	511/1564	4.63	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	347/1559	4.79	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1113/1352	3.38	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	673/1384	4.25	3.52	4.08	4.35	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.71	3.84	4.29	4.56	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	3.63	4.30	4.58	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	389/ 948	4.14	3.50	3.95	4.31	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.54	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 451 0101  
 Title MECH OF ORGANIC REACTI  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 394  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 470 0101  
 Title TOXICOLOGICAL CHEMISTR  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 395  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	14	4.65	446/1649	4.65	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	702/1648	4.40	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	412/1375	4.65	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	759/1595	4.30	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	9	7	4.11	748/1533	4.11	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	627/1512	4.30	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	815/1623	4.25	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1148/1646	4.55	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	252/1621	4.64	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	147/1568	4.95	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	600/1564	4.55	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	318/1559	4.80	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	4	6	1	3.21	1173/1352	3.21	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	921/1384	3.83	3.52	4.08	4.35	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	11 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 396  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	216/1648	4.80	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1595	4.80	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1533	4.80	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1623	5.00	3.84	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1621	4.80	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.13	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	5.00	3.90	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	3.79	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.60	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	3.52	4.08	4.35	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1368	4.60	3.63	4.30	4.58	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490B 0101  
 Title CHEMOMETRICS  
 Instructor: FOUNTAIN, AUGUS  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 397  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	644/1649	4.50	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1112/1375	3.75	3.57	4.27	4.48	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	220/1623	4.75	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1388/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.40	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	966/1559	4.25	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	515/1352	4.25	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	3.52	4.08	4.35	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	3.84	4.29	4.56	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	945/ 948	1.00	3.50	3.95	4.31	1.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.54	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.57	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.44	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.83	3.68	3.71	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	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 690 0101  
 Title CHEMISTRY SEMINAR  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 398  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	3.88	4.23	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.35	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.84	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	3.64	4.06	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.13	4.43	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1463/1572	4.00	4.23	4.70	4.83	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	3.90	4.28	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	3.79	4.29	4.41	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.33	4.54	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.83	3.68	3.87	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	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 2						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 0						