

Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101  
 Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 63  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 246  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	10	21	4.42	794/1670	4.42	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	19	4.33	870/1666	4.33	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	13	20	4.39	739/1406	4.39	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	7	21	4.32	787/1615	4.32	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	10	19	4.28	621/1566	4.28	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	11	6	15	3.86	1072/1528	3.86	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	11	19	4.31	844/1650	4.31	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	19	15	4.36	1287/1667	4.36	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	11	13	4.19	797/1626	4.19	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	28	4.72	572/1559	4.72	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	28	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	12	22	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	25	4.58	619/1546	4.58	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	3	7	8	12	3.87	842/1323	3.87	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	30	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	26
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 17	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 11	Under-grad	36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	36
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0	Other	5
			I 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 247  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	10	8	11	3.93	1305/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	15	10	4.17	1070/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	11	10	4.03	1039/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	2	12	3	3	3.14	1555/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	10	10	7	3.82	1088/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	1	8	2	3	3.33	1368/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	11	6	3.71	1382/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	23	3	4.04	1508/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	4	12	5	3.95	1038/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	883/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	1	1	22	4.72	1023/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	9	14	4.50	683/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	1032/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	9	6	5	3.80	894/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	4	5	5	4	2.96	1279/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	2	4	8	6	3.52	1185/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	7	5	5	3.30	1266/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	461/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 247  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 248  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NA		1	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	11	3.93	1305/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	15	10	4.17	1070/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	11	10	4.03	1039/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	2	12	3	3	3.14	1555/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	10	10	7	3.82	1088/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	1	8	2	3	3.33	1368/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	11	6	3.71	1382/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	23	3	4.04	1508/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	1	11	6	1	3.25	1491/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	1022/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	1376/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	1146/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1337/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	692/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	4	5	5	4	2.96	1279/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	2	4	8	6	3.52	1185/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	7	5	5	3.30	1266/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	461/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 248  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 249  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	10	8	11	3.93	1305/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	15	10	4.17	1070/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	11	10	4.03	1039/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	2	12	3	3	3.14	1555/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	10	10	7	3.82	1088/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	1	8	2	3	3.33	1368/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	11	6	3.71	1382/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	23	3	4.04	1508/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	2	6	8	1	3.47	1400/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	6	0	9	4.00	1280/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	2	0	2	3	9	4.06	1463/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1146/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1309/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	990/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	4	5	5	4	2.96	1279/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	2	4	8	6	3.52	1185/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	7	5	5	3.30	1266/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	461/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 249  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 250  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	0	10	8	11	3.93	1305/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	15	10	4.17	1070/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	11	10	4.03	1039/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	2	12	3	3	3.14	1555/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	10	10	7	3.82	1088/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	1	8	2	3	3.33	1368/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	11	6	3.71	1382/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	23	3	4.04	1508/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	681/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	6	0	10	4.25	1157/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1066/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	451/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1139/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	941/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	4	5	5	4	2.96	1279/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	2	4	8	6	3.52	1185/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	7	5	5	3.30	1266/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	461/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 250  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 251  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	6	23	18	4.21	1049/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	16	21	4.21	1015/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	18	13	3.83	1169/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	5	6	12	5	3.43	1481/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	11	16	9	3.82	1098/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	1	5	3	11	3	3.43	1311/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	2	9	16	16	4.07	1101/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	4	29	7	4.02	1513/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	0	1	5	18	10	4.09	910/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	5	15	21	4.31	1122/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	9	34	4.79	873/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	5	17	18	4.32	912/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	1	3	9	27	4.55	655/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	14	6	4	1	7	7	3.20	1143/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	5	18	19	4.20	703/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	7	11	25	4.34	785/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	5	15	14	3.97	1000/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	3	14	20	4.31	345/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 252  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	23	18	4.21	1049/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	16	21	4.21	1015/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	18	13	3.83	1169/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	5	6	12	5	3.43	1481/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	11	16	9	3.82	1098/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	1	5	3	11	3	3.43	1311/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	2	9	16	16	4.07	1101/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	4	29	7	4.02	1513/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	3	0	0	8	18	4	3.87	1162/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	784/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	1090/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	3	17	10	4.23	994/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	2	8	18	4.40	849/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	3	1	2	6	7	13	4.00	692/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	5	18	19	4.20	703/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	7	11	25	4.34	785/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	5	15	14	3.97	1000/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	3	14	20	4.31	345/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	13							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General		0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		29				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 253  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	23	18	4.21	1049/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	16	21	4.21	1015/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	18	13	3.83	1169/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	5	6	12	5	3.43	1481/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	11	16	9	3.82	1098/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	1	5	3	11	3	3.43	1311/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	2	9	16	16	4.07	1101/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	4	29	7	4.02	1513/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	1	1	6	14	7	3.86	1162/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	1	0	2	8	14	4.36	1062/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	1294/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	1	2	11	11	4.28	952/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	4	5	13	4.17	1056/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	4	4	0	4	6	5	3.42	1073/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	5	18	19	4.20	703/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	7	11	25	4.34	785/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	5	15	14	3.97	1000/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	3	14	20	4.31	345/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	13							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General		0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		29				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 254  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	23	18	4.21	1049/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	16	21	4.21	1015/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	18	13	3.83	1169/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	5	6	12	5	3.43	1481/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	11	16	9	3.82	1098/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	1	5	3	11	3	3.43	1311/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	2	9	16	16	4.07	1101/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	4	29	7	4.02	1513/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	0	3	17	10	4.23	751/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.01
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	1	0	2	5	17	4.48	921/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	1114/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	562/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	715/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	4	3	0	4	5	7	3.68	950/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.58
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	5	18	19	4.20	703/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	7	11	25	4.34	785/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	5	15	14	3.97	1000/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	3	14	20	4.31	345/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.31
-----														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	13							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General		0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		29				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 255  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	5	9	9	4.04	1194/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	1173/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	6	13	4.08	1009/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	3	11	4	3.95	1173/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	1	9	9	4.09	796/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	3	0	4	8	4.13	814/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	1043/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	18	4	4.04	1503/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	0	1	10	3	3.93	1072/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	846/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	1042/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	3	14	4.30	936/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	822/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	4	6	3	6	3.45	1061/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	1	6	10	3.95	876/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	695/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	965/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	345/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 255  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 256  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	1	0	5	9	9	4.04	1194/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	1173/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	6	13	4.08	1009/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	3	11	4	3.95	1173/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	1	9	9	4.09	796/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	3	0	4	8	4.13	814/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	1043/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	18	4	4.04	1503/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	0	5	5	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	858/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	829/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	977/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	1002/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	794/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	1	6	10	3.95	876/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	695/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	965/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	345/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 256  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 257  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	1	0	5	9	9	4.04	1194/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	1173/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	6	13	4.08	1009/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	3	11	4	3.95	1173/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	1	9	9	4.09	796/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	3	0	4	8	4.13	814/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	1043/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	18	4	4.04	1503/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1220/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	521/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1163/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	749/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	715/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	481/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	1	6	10	3.95	876/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	695/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	965/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	345/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 257  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 258  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	1	0	5	9	9	4.04	1194/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	1173/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	6	13	4.08	1009/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	3	11	4	3.95	1173/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	1	9	9	4.09	796/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	3	0	4	8	4.13	814/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	1043/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	18	4	4.04	1503/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	2	0	3	5	1	3.27	1483/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	1092/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	1279/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1237/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	1040/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	481/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	1	6	10	3.95	876/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	695/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	965/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	345/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 258  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 259  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	9	7	4.35	876/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	919/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	876/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1083/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1068/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1113/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	338/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1423/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	854/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	1042/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	725/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	549/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	457/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	990/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	608/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	797/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1110/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	570/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 260  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	9	7	4.35	876/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	919/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	876/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1083/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1068/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1113/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	338/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1423/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	1427/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	722/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1214/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	562/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	889/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	567/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	608/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	797/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1110/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	570/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 261  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	9	7	4.35	876/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	919/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	876/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1083/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1068/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1113/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	338/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1423/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	637/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	435/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1248/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	762/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	595/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	545/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	608/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	797/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1110/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	570/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
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	7				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 262  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	5	14	15	12	3.38	1573/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	17	17	10	3.43	1532/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	4	10	15	15	3.48	1281/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	3	9	12	7	8	3.21	1544/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	6	12	11	15	3.73	1159/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	4	7	9	5	3	2.86	1482/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	7	10	11	21	3.88	1288/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	4	1	29	13	4.02	1513/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	1	0	11	11	10	3.88	1152/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	1	8	12	24	4.24	1171/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	6	5	33	4.56	1205/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	8	10	27	4.35	888/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	3	6	10	22	4.02	1131/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	14	4	2	5	6	10	3.59	995/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	7	6	10	8	5	2.94	1283/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	5	3	7	6	15	3.64	1147/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	8	8	7	9	3.31	1262/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	3	4	4	5	13	3.72	643/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 19			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	1	Under-grad 54 Non-major 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	26	
			? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 263  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	5	14	15	12	3.38	1573/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	17	17	10	3.43	1532/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	4	10	15	15	3.48	1281/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	3	9	12	7	8	3.21	1544/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	6	12	11	15	3.73	1159/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	4	7	9	5	3	2.86	1482/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	7	10	11	21	3.88	1288/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	4	1	29	13	4.02	1513/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	0	2	0	6	12	2	3.55	1369/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	2	4	7	8	10	3.65	1437/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	2	1	6	4	15	4.04	1465/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	4	2	10	5	7	3.32	1445/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	1	8	2	6	6	5	2.93	1491/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	5	2	4	5	3	6	3.35	1094/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	7	6	10	8	5	2.94	1283/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	5	3	7	6	15	3.64	1147/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	8	8	7	9	3.31	1262/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	3	4	4	5	13	3.72	643/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 19			Major 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	1	Under-grad 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1			Non-major 54
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	26	
			? 1			

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 264  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	5	14	15	12	3.38	1573/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	17	17	10	3.43	1532/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	4	10	15	15	3.48	1281/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	3	9	12	7	8	3.21	1544/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	6	12	11	15	3.73	1159/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	4	7	9	5	3	2.86	1482/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	7	10	11	21	3.88	1288/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	4	1	29	13	4.02	1513/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	0	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	681/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	3	6	2	13	4.04	1270/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	1	4	4	16	4.40	1326/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	9	4	13	4.15	1061/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	5	5	2	10	3.65	1333/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	3	1	2	5	3	6	3.65	970/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	7	6	10	8	5	2.94	1283/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	5	3	7	6	15	3.64	1147/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	8	8	7	9	3.31	1262/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	3	4	4	5	13	3.72	643/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 19			Major 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	1	Under-grad 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1			Non-major 54
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	26	
			? 1			

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 265  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	5	14	15	12	3.38	1573/1670	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	17	17	10	3.43	1532/1666	4.02	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	4	10	15	15	3.48	1281/1406	3.92	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	3	9	12	7	8	3.21	1544/1615	3.52	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	6	12	11	15	3.73	1159/1566	3.86	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	4	7	9	5	3	2.86	1482/1528	3.50	3.72	4.12	4.00	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	7	10	11	21	3.88	1288/1650	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	4	1	29	13	4.02	1513/1667	4.05	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	0	5	6	9	3	0	2.43	1599/1626	3.77	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	6	5	7	1	3	2.55	1540/1559	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	6	4	8	4	3	2.76	1557/1560	4.45	4.44	4.72	4.68	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	8	6	7	2	2	2.36	1529/1549	4.18	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	4	6	3	5	3	2	2.58	1520/1546	4.07	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	7	4	3	3	1	2	2.54	****/1323	3.78	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	7	6	10	8	5	2.94	1283/1384	3.64	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	5	3	7	6	15	3.64	1147/1378	4.04	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	8	8	7	9	3.31	1262/1378	3.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	3	4	4	5	13	3.72	643/ 904	4.05	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 19			Major 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	1	Under-grad 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1			Non-major 54
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	26	
			? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 266  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	14	16	5	3.62	1502/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	6	13	12	3.86	1344/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	8	13	10	3.75	1206/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	2	8	7	3	3.32	1516/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	3	9	8	10	3.66	1205/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	3	5	4	5	3.50	1274/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	8	13	12	3.94	1220/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	805/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	716/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	3	12	20	4.30	1129/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	3	1	9	22	4.43	1310/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	11	18	4.22	1002/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	7	23	4.42	835/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	2	6	6	14	4.03	681/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	2	8	12	5	3.18	1227/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	5	9	10	3.55	1178/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	6	8	4	9	3.19	1289/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.19
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	4	1	4	8	9	3.65	675/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 266  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 267  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	14	16	5	3.62	1502/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	6	13	12	3.86	1344/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	8	13	10	3.75	1206/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	2	8	7	3	3.32	1516/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	3	9	8	10	3.66	1205/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	3	5	4	5	3.50	1274/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	8	13	12	3.94	1220/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	805/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	2	0	7	9	1	3.37	1452/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	1	6	4	15	4.15	1230/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	2	8	16	4.41	1326/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	2	1	4	12	6	3.76	1303/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	4	6	7	3.28	1436/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	6	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	970/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	2	8	12	5	3.18	1227/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	5	9	10	3.55	1178/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	6	8	4	9	3.19	1289/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.19
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	4	1	4	8	9	3.65	675/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 267  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 268  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	14	16	5	3.62	1502/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	6	13	12	3.86	1344/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	8	13	10	3.75	1206/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	2	8	7	3	3.32	1516/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	3	9	8	10	3.66	1205/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	3	5	4	5	3.50	1274/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	8	13	12	3.94	1220/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	805/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	2	9	6	0	3.24	1498/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	1396/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	5	8	8	4.00	1467/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	1	9	7	3	3.48	1401/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	3	7	3	5	3.30	1432/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	6	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1000/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	2	8	12	5	3.18	1227/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	5	9	10	3.55	1178/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	6	8	4	9	3.19	1289/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.19
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	4	1	4	8	9	3.65	675/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 268  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 269  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	14	16	5	3.62	1502/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	6	13	12	3.86	1344/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	8	13	10	3.75	1206/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	2	8	7	3	3.32	1516/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	3	9	8	10	3.66	1205/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	3	5	4	5	3.50	1274/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	8	13	12	3.94	1220/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	805/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	0	2	7	7	0	3.31	1469/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	1	6	5	8	3.86	1374/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	4	7	10	4.14	1449/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	2	6	8	4	3.57	1372/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	2	7	3	6	3.45	1395/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	6	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1000/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	2	8	12	5	3.18	1227/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	5	9	10	3.55	1178/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	6	8	4	9	3.19	1289/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.19
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	4	1	4	8	9	3.65	675/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 269  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 270  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	11	18	9	3.49	1542/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	12	16	13	3.68	1443/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	6	8	11	17	3.73	1214/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	4	5	7	9	6	3.26	1531/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	5	3	13	9	10	3.40	1348/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	4	1	8	5	1	2.89	1477/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	12	7	21	3.93	1235/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	1	1	0	1	39	4.81	861/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	2	9	13	8	3.76	1254/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	6	8	30	4.55	846/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	8	8	28	4.40	1326/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	12	12	19	4.04	1129/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	6	12	22	4.11	1095/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	3	2	10	6	18	3.87	842/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	7	4	14	8	9	3.19	1219/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	2	9	10	17	3.81	1092/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	6	4	11	8	13	3.43	1221/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	6	4	4	6	18	3.68	662/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.68
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 270  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 271  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	5	11	18	9	3.49	1542/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	12	16	13	3.68	1443/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	6	8	11	17	3.73	1214/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	4	5	7	9	6	3.26	1531/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	5	3	13	9	10	3.40	1348/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	4	1	8	5	1	2.89	1477/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	12	7	21	3.93	1235/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	1	1	0	1	39	4.81	861/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	3	2	16	6	5	3.25	1491/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	5	7	15	4.37	1052/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	2	5	5	17	4.28	1405/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	1	0	12	4	10	3.81	1280/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	2	2	7	5	8	3.63	1345/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	3	3	0	6	5	7	3.62	985/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	7	4	14	8	9	3.19	1219/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	2	9	10	17	3.81	1092/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	6	4	11	8	13	3.43	1221/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	6	4	4	6	18	3.68	662/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.68
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 271  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 272  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	4	5	11	18	9	3.49	1542/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	12	16	13	3.68	1443/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	6	8	11	17	3.73	1214/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	4	5	7	9	6	3.26	1531/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	5	3	13	9	10	3.40	1348/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	4	1	8	5	1	2.89	1477/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	12	7	21	3.93	1235/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	1	1	0	1	39	4.81	861/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	2	0	9	18	2	3.58	1354/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	1	0	5	2	11	4.16	1224/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	0	5	2	13	4.24	1416/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	0	5	3	9	4.06	1125/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	979/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	4	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	****/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	7	4	14	8	9	3.19	1219/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	2	9	10	17	3.81	1092/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	6	4	11	8	13	3.43	1221/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	6	4	4	6	18	3.68	662/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.68
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 272  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 273  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	4	5	11	18	9	3.49	1542/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	12	16	13	3.68	1443/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	6	8	11	17	3.73	1214/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	4	5	7	9	6	3.26	1531/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	5	3	13	9	10	3.40	1348/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	4	1	8	5	1	2.89	1477/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	12	7	21	3.93	1235/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	1	1	0	1	39	4.81	861/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	0	7	15	8	3.94	1072/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	0	4	1	12	4.28	1143/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	0	4	2	14	4.33	1376/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	0	5	3	9	4.06	1125/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	919/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	4	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	****/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	7	4	14	8	9	3.19	1219/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	2	9	10	17	3.81	1092/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	6	4	11	8	13	3.43	1221/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	6	4	4	6	18	3.68	662/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.68
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 273  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 274  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	16	18	4.00	1216/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	8	16	16	3.98	1234/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	8	16	12	3.68	1230/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	13	11	9	3.72	1343/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	11	10	14	3.78	1129/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	4	7	9	4	3.44	1306/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	6	13	19	3.95	1206/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	6	34	4.78	885/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	2	1	6	12	9	3.83	1191/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	3	1	7	29	4.30	1122/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	3	1	8	29	4.37	1347/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	6	8	25	4.19	1036/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	4	4	10	21	4.07	1113/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	3	3	6	10	15	3.84	871/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	10	16	7	3.61	1057/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	3	6	11	16	3.95	1022/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	14	8	12	3.66	1150/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	4	3	11	6	14	3.61	698/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.61
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 11	General 1	Under-grad 44 Non-major 43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 30	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 275  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	16	18	4.00	1216/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	8	16	16	3.98	1234/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	8	16	12	3.68	1230/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	13	11	9	3.72	1343/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	11	10	14	3.78	1129/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	4	7	9	4	3.44	1306/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	6	13	19	3.95	1206/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	6	34	4.78	885/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	2	12	10	3	3.52	1380/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	2	0	4	7	20	4.30	1122/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	2	1	2	7	20	4.31	1390/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	2	1	9	9	11	3.81	1280/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	2	2	2	4	11	9	3.82	1264/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	3	1	8	8	8	3.61	990/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	10	16	7	3.61	1057/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	3	6	11	16	3.95	1022/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	14	8	12	3.66	1150/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	4	3	11	6	14	3.61	698/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.61
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 11	General 1	Under-grad 44	Non-major 43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 30		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 276  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	16	18	4.00	1216/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	8	16	16	3.98	1234/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	8	16	12	3.68	1230/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	13	11	9	3.72	1343/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	11	10	14	3.78	1129/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	4	7	9	4	3.44	1306/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	6	13	19	3.95	1206/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	6	34	4.78	885/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	0	0	6	14	5	3.96	1021/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	871/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	1	8	18	4.54	1222/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	2	1	9	14	4.35	888/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	869/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	692/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	10	16	7	3.61	1057/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	3	6	11	16	3.95	1022/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	14	8	12	3.66	1150/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	4	3	11	6	14	3.61	698/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.61
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 11	General 1	Under-grad 44 Non-major 43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 30	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 277  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	16	18	4.00	1216/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	8	16	16	3.98	1234/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	8	16	12	3.68	1230/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	13	11	9	3.72	1343/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	11	10	14	3.78	1129/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	4	7	9	4	3.44	1306/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	6	13	19	3.95	1206/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	6	34	4.78	885/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	1	0	7	13	4	3.76	1247/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	1062/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	1	11	15	4.43	1310/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	1	2	13	10	4.23	994/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	1071/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	1	2	3	7	6	3.79	903/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	10	16	7	3.61	1057/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	3	6	11	16	3.95	1022/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	14	8	12	3.66	1150/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	4	3	11	6	14	3.61	698/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.61
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 11	General 1	Under-grad 44 Non-major 43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 30	
			? 2		



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 278  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	5	3	4	22	15	3.80	1419/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	21	17	4.04	1173/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	6	20	19	4.17	940/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	3	0	7	13	7	3.70	1356/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	8	17	11	3.71	1173/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	3	2	5	12	6	3.57	1245/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	6	14	23	4.24	926/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	749/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	3	0	8	12	15	3.95	1055/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	16	31	4.66	689/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	11	33	4.64	1126/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	18	24	4.42	789/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	1	11	29	4.40	849/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	2	5	10	20	4.21	575/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	9	16	9	3.56	1075/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	8	12	18	4.02	962/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	3	12	12	10	3.64	1153/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	6	6	14	10	3.63	684/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	11							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	9	General		0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		38				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 279  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	5	3	4	22	15	3.80	1419/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	21	17	4.04	1173/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	6	20	19	4.17	940/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	3	0	7	13	7	3.70	1356/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	8	17	11	3.71	1173/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	3	2	5	12	6	3.57	1245/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	6	14	23	4.24	926/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	749/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	3	7	15	9	4	3.11	1529/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	2	0	4	9	16	4.19	1199/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	5	4	21	4.45	1287/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	2	2	4	9	11	3.89	1241/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	0	6	8	8	3.72	1305/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	4	0	2	3	7	12	4.21	583/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	9	16	9	3.56	1075/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	8	12	18	4.02	962/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	3	12	12	10	3.64	1153/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	6	6	14	10	3.63	684/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 280  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	5	3	4	22	15	3.80	1419/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	21	17	4.04	1173/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	6	20	19	4.17	940/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	3	0	7	13	7	3.70	1356/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	8	17	11	3.71	1173/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	3	2	5	12	6	3.57	1245/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	6	14	23	4.24	926/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	749/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	2	14	12	7	3.54	1369/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	959/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	1	0	2	8	15	4.38	1340/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	936/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	0	3	8	8	3.95	1185/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	6	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	537/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	9	16	9	3.56	1075/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	8	12	18	4.02	962/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	3	12	12	10	3.64	1153/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	6	6	14	10	3.63	684/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	15	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 6	C 9	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 49
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	38
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 281  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	5	3	4	22	15	3.80	1419/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	21	17	4.04	1173/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	6	20	19	4.17	940/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	3	0	7	13	7	3.70	1356/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	8	17	11	3.71	1173/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	3	2	5	12	6	3.57	1245/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	6	14	23	4.24	926/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	749/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	3	6	16	11	3.89	1133/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	896/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	1	0	2	8	15	4.38	1340/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	888/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	0	2	9	7	3.95	1185/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	6	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	448/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	9	16	9	3.56	1075/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	8	12	18	4.02	962/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	3	12	12	10	3.64	1153/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	6	6	14	10	3.63	684/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	11							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	9	General		0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		38				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 282  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	6	16	21	4.20	1060/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	16	22	4.31	895/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	22	16	4.16	956/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	8	11	8	3.93	1203/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	5	11	14	3.89	1029/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	1	2	6	4	6	3.63	1217/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	11	24	4.33	819/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	1	39	4.90	675/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	3	24	8	4.06	926/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	8	32	4.63	739/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	8	31	4.60	1163/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	6	10	26	4.48	722/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	13	26	4.37	879/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	2	12	23	4.35	465/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	3	10	11	13	3.57	1070/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	2	8	11	18	4.00	970/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	6	2	10	11	12	3.51	1186/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	3	3	6	6	18	3.92	559/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 45 Non-major 43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 29	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 283  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	6	16	21	4.20	1060/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	16	22	4.31	895/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	22	16	4.16	956/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	8	11	8	3.93	1203/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	5	11	14	3.89	1029/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	1	2	6	4	6	3.63	1217/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	11	24	4.33	819/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	1	39	4.90	675/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	2	12	13	4	3.45	1411/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	1122/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	1	1	5	12	4.30	1398/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1275/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	1	3	5	7	3.78	1285/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	1	2	1	2	6	9	3.95	756/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	3	10	11	13	3.57	1070/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	2	8	11	18	4.00	970/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	6	2	10	11	12	3.51	1186/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	3	3	6	6	18	3.92	559/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	15							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General		0	Under-grad	45	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		29				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 284  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	6	16	21	4.20	1060/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	16	22	4.31	895/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	22	16	4.16	956/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	8	11	8	3.93	1203/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	5	11	14	3.89	1029/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	1	2	6	4	6	3.63	1217/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	11	24	4.33	819/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	1	39	4.90	675/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	8	2	8	8	2	2.79	1576/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	4	1	2	2	2	2.73	****/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	3	3	2	3	4	3.13	1545/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	****/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	3	2	1	2	3.25	****/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	6	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	3	10	11	13	3.57	1070/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	2	8	11	18	4.00	970/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	6	2	10	11	12	3.51	1186/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	3	3	6	6	18	3.92	559/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	15							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General		0	Under-grad	45	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		29				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 285  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	6	16	21	4.20	1060/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	16	22	4.31	895/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	22	16	4.16	956/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	8	11	8	3.93	1203/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	5	11	14	3.89	1029/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	1	2	6	4	6	3.63	1217/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	11	24	4.33	819/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	1	39	4.90	675/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	0	0	7	11	8	4.04	937/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	****/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	1376/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	****/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	****/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	5	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	3	10	11	13	3.57	1070/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	2	8	11	18	4.00	970/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	6	2	10	11	12	3.51	1186/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	3	3	6	6	18	3.92	559/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	15							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General		0	Under-grad	45	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		29				
				?	2							



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 286  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	10	12	20	4.19	1071/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	9	22	4.19	1048/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	13	20	4.17	948/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	1234/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	3	1	6	10	12	3.84	1068/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	17	3	3	6	1	8	3.38	1339/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	6	8	21	4.24	926/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	1	0	1	2	31	4.77	897/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	1	3	12	14	4.19	797/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	3	4	30	4.56	821/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	8	28	4.64	1114/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	8	26	4.46	736/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	6	5	26	4.38	869/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	2	3	5	20	4.43	393/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	4	15	13	3.92	920/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	14	20	4.41	718/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	6	9	18	4.08	953/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	0	6	9	18	4.17	413/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 43 Non-major 42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 287  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	10	12	20	4.19	1071/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	9	22	4.19	1048/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	13	20	4.17	948/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	1234/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	3	1	6	10	12	3.84	1068/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	17	3	3	6	1	8	3.38	1339/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	6	8	21	4.24	926/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	1	0	1	2	31	4.77	897/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	1	5	16	6	3.86	1162/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	755/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	911/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	864/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	3	1	2	13	4.32	939/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	3	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	294/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	4	15	13	3.92	920/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	14	20	4.41	718/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	6	9	18	4.08	953/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	0	6	9	18	4.17	413/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors		3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	18							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General		0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		28				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 288  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	10	12	20	4.19	1071/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	9	22	4.19	1048/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	13	20	4.17	948/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	1234/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	3	1	6	10	12	3.84	1068/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	17	3	3	6	1	8	3.38	1339/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	6	8	21	4.24	926/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	1	0	1	2	31	4.77	897/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	2	12	14	4.43	531/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1265/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	1023/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	762/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	3	1	11	4.38	879/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	3	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	507/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	4	15	13	3.92	920/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	14	20	4.41	718/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	6	9	18	4.08	953/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	0	6	9	18	4.17	413/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 43 Non-major 42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 289  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	10	12	20	4.19	1071/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	9	22	4.19	1048/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	13	20	4.17	948/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	1234/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	3	1	6	10	12	3.84	1068/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	17	3	3	6	1	8	3.38	1339/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	6	8	21	4.24	926/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	1	0	1	2	31	4.77	897/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	4	3	12	5	4	3.07	1530/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	1442/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	3	2	4	3	9	3.62	1517/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	2	3	2	9	3.78	1299/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	3	1	1	1	10	3.88	1244/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	3	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	619/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	4	15	13	3.92	920/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	14	20	4.41	718/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	6	9	18	4.08	953/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	0	6	9	18	4.17	413/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 43 Non-major 42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 290  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	7	20	17	4.02	1205/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	25	18	4.30	919/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	19	21	4.30	836/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	3	0	6	14	8	3.77	1312/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	1	6	15	18	4.17	724/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	1176/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	2	16	24	4.36	782/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	0	0	3	4	34	4.76	922/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	2	3	22	11	4.11	900/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	5	35	4.74	538/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	5	36	4.79	873/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	15	25	4.48	722/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	3	8	29	4.50	715/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	0	4	6	25	4.50	326/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	6	10	19	4.13	768/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	6	9	22	4.34	785/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	2	8	7	16	3.78	1095/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	2	11	4	18	4.00	461/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 8	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	37				
				? 3						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 291  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	7	20	17	4.02	1205/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	25	18	4.30	919/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	19	21	4.30	836/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	3	0	6	14	8	3.77	1312/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	1	6	15	18	4.17	724/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	1176/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	2	16	24	4.36	782/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	0	0	3	4	34	4.76	922/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	5	2	18	11	4	3.17	1515/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	3	11	17	4.45	959/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	1171/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	0	9	8	8	3.85	1265/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	1	5	8	9	3.73	1301/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	5	1	0	7	5	10	4.00	692/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	6	10	19	4.13	768/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	6	9	22	4.34	785/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	2	8	7	16	3.78	1095/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	2	11	4	18	4.00	461/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	15	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 8	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	37

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 292  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	7	20	17	4.02	1205/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	25	18	4.30	919/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	19	21	4.30	836/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	3	0	6	14	8	3.77	1312/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	1	6	15	18	4.17	724/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	1176/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	2	16	24	4.36	782/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	0	0	3	4	34	4.76	922/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	0	8	20	9	4.03	942/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	846/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	1102/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	5	8	8	4.14	1070/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	2	1	4	4	9	3.85	1252/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	11	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	****/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	6	10	19	4.13	768/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	6	9	22	4.34	785/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	2	8	7	16	3.78	1095/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	2	11	4	18	4.00	461/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 8	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	37				
				? 3						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 293  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	7	20	17	4.02	1205/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	25	18	4.30	919/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	19	21	4.30	836/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	3	0	6	14	8	3.77	1312/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	1	6	15	18	4.17	724/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	1176/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	2	16	24	4.36	782/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	3	0	0	3	4	34	4.76	922/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	1	7	18	12	4.08	915/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	834/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	1197/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	936/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	1	3	5	9	3.90	1232/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	11	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	****/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	6	10	19	4.13	768/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	6	9	22	4.34	785/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	2	8	7	16	3.78	1095/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	2	11	4	18	4.00	461/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 8	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	37				
				? 3						



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 294  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	0	0	2	14	9	23	4.10	1162/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	11	16	18	4.02	1186/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	4	13	9	20	3.98	1079/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	5	6	13	10	3.82	1282/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	0	3	9	13	12	3.92	994/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	21	1	5	9	6	4	3.28	1391/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	15	25	4.29	855/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	1	4	40	4.87	749/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	0	3	18	10	4.23	762/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	3	2	9	30	4.50	896/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	3	1	9	31	4.55	1214/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	6	10	27	4.43	776/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	3	11	27	4.39	869/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	2	2	5	8	19	4.11	648/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	9	12	16	3.83	962/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	7	8	22	4.07	943/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	6	0	11	8	17	3.71	1130/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	0	8	9	22	4.20	405/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 294  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 295  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	0	0	2	14	9	23	4.10	1162/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	11	16	18	4.02	1186/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	4	13	9	20	3.98	1079/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	5	6	13	10	3.82	1282/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	0	3	9	13	12	3.92	994/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	21	1	5	9	6	4	3.28	1391/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	15	25	4.29	855/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	1	4	40	4.87	749/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	1	7	20	6	3.91	1106/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	4	3	17	4.40	1022/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	0	3	2	23	4.59	1180/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	1	4	5	16	4.38	840/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	1	4	4	16	4.27	979/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	4	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	590/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	9	12	16	3.83	962/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	7	8	22	4.07	943/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	6	0	11	8	17	3.71	1130/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	0	8	9	22	4.20	405/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 295  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 296  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	14	9	23	4.10	1162/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	11	16	18	4.02	1186/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	4	13	9	20	3.98	1079/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	5	6	13	10	3.82	1282/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	0	3	9	13	12	3.92	994/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	21	1	5	9	6	4	3.28	1391/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	15	25	4.29	855/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	1	4	40	4.87	749/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	0	2	13	16	4.45	483/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	971/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	1054/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	488/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	655/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	4	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	****/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	9	12	16	3.83	962/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	7	8	22	4.07	943/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	6	0	11	8	17	3.71	1130/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	0	8	9	22	4.20	405/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 296  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 297  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	14	9	23	4.10	1162/1670	3.93	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	11	16	18	4.02	1186/1666	4.05	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	4	13	9	20	3.98	1079/1406	3.99	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	5	6	13	10	3.82	1282/1615	3.68	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	0	3	9	13	12	3.92	994/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	21	1	5	9	6	4	3.28	1391/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	15	25	4.29	855/1650	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	1	4	40	4.87	749/1667	4.82	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	9	4	10	8	0	2.55	1592/1626	3.71	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	3	1	3	1	7	3.53	1457/1559	4.32	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	4	3	1	3	7	3.33	1538/1560	4.36	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	5	1	4	1	5	3.00	1489/1549	4.10	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	3	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	1213/1546	4.05	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	7	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/1323	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	9	12	16	3.83	962/1384	3.62	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	7	8	22	4.07	943/1378	4.02	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	6	0	11	8	17	3.71	1130/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	0	8	9	22	4.20	405/ 904	3.86	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 297  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 298  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	9	9	3	3.52	1531/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	7	4.09	1148/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1169/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	10	6	3.90	1234/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	8	4	3.52	1274/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	1233/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	8	6	3.65	1409/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	823/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	2	13	1	3.72	1275/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	8	11	4	3.83	1387/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	1271/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	13	6	4.04	1129/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	10	8	4	3.61	1354/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	4	2	6	3	0	2.53	1267/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	2.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1018/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1214/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1061/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	671/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	5	8	6	3.81	180/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	146/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.05
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	144/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	135/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	66/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 298  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PETROVA, SILVIY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 299  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	9	9	3	3.52	1531/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	7	4.09	1148/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1169/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	10	6	3.90	1234/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	8	4	3.52	1274/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	1233/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	8	6	3.65	1409/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	823/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	5	10	2	3.67	1312/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1280/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1427/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1209/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	1349/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1236/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	2.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1018/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1214/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1061/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	671/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	5	8	6	3.81	180/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	146/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.05
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	144/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	135/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	66/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PETROVA, SILVIY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 299  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 300  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	8	4	9	3.79	1419/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	8	9	3.88	1337/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1142/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1083/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	10	3.96	930/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	2	3	3	6	3.41	1322/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	1	10	7	3.63	1421/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	607/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	8	6	4	3.63	1329/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	6	13	4.25	1157/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	21	4.71	1042/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	7	12	4.17	1053/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	2	15	4.13	1087/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	5	2	6	0	5	2.89	1229/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	5	0	1	2	2	2.60	1327/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1326/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	2	3	0	3	3.22	1282/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	594/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	162/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	168/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	160/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	192/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	3.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	131/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 300  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 301  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	8	4	9	3.79	1419/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	8	9	3.88	1337/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1142/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1083/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	10	3.96	930/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	2	3	3	6	3.41	1322/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	1	10	7	3.63	1421/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	607/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	3	9	3	3.76	1247/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	1199/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	1294/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	1104/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	4	10	3.95	1185/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	2	1	5	0	4	3.25	1125/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	5	0	1	2	2	2.60	1327/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1326/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	2	3	0	3	3.22	1282/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	594/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	162/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	168/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	160/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	192/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	3.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	131/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 301  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 302  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NA		1	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	10	7	3.83	1393/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	12	4	3.79	1388/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	1	3	9	5	3.57	1257/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	8	7	5	3.68	1368/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	1010/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1274/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	3	9	7	3.58	1436/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	338/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	5	9	2	3.71	1289/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	6	9	7	3.83	1382/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	6	10	4	3.65	1348/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	2	6	9	3.63	1345/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	7	5	2	3.29	1110/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	6	4	3	3.25	1200/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	2	2	1	7	3.31	1253/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	4	3	2	2.75	1333/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	873/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	2.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	160/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	165/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	155/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	124/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	135/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 302  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	19				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 303  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	4	10	7	3.83	1393/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	12	4	3.79	1388/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	1	3	9	5	3.57	1257/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	8	7	5	3.68	1368/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	1010/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1274/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	3	9	7	3.58	1436/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	338/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	953/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	1268/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	1427/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	3	10	4	3.79	1294/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1289/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1099/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	6	4	3	3.25	1200/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	2	2	1	7	3.31	1253/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	4	3	2	2.75	1333/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	873/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	2.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	160/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	165/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	155/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	124/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	135/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 303  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	19				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 304  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	6	3.90	1318/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1202/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	4	3	4	7	3.78	1312/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	7	6	4	3.58	1246/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	4	4	4	4	3.50	1274/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1304/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	6	7	1	3.53	1372/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	7	7	3.95	1316/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	855/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	6	3	8	3.71	1327/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	8	7	3.85	1252/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	1	2	3	6	3.38	1089/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	****/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	9	5	4.20	125/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	111/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	63/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	108/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.53	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	111/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.31	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13							
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		19				
				?	0							

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 305  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	6	3.90	1318/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1202/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	4	3	4	7	3.78	1312/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	7	6	4	3.58	1246/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	4	4	4	4	3.50	1274/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1304/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	563/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	1224/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	1205/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	900/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	1121/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	960/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	****/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	9	5	4.20	125/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	111/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	63/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	108/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.53	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	111/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.31	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13							
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		19				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 306  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	6	11	2	3.65	1490/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	8	2	3.60	1479/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	4	5	6	0	3.13	1338/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	8	2	2	3.29	1524/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	8	3	6	3.78	1129/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1368/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	11	3	6	3.75	1359/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	7	9	3	3.79	1233/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	10	6	4.10	1256/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	1102/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	6	7	3.85	1261/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	7	7	3.70	1313/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	2	2	5	0	2.75	1248/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1260/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1236/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1344/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	2.63
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	3	4	7	3	3.44	206/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	163/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	178/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	2	3	4	7	2	3.22	217/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	3.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	133/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.13
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	19
?	1		



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: DAPHNIS, SUZE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 307  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	11	2	3.65	1490/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	8	2	3.60	1479/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	4	5	6	0	3.13	1338/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	8	2	2	3.29	1524/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	8	3	6	3.78	1129/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1368/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	11	3	6	3.75	1359/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	10	8	0	3.32	1469/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1387/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1508/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	7	2	3.41	1426/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	1374/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1269/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1260/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1236/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1344/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	2.63
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	3	4	7	3	3.44	206/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	163/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	178/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	2	3	4	7	2	3.22	217/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	3.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	133/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.13
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	19
?	1		

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 308  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	2	3	10	7	3.87	1372/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	12	5	3.87	1344/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	4	5	7	3.70	1226/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	1083/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	8	10	4.18	715/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	1088/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	12	4.22	950/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	885/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	11	4	3.90	1124/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	12	7	3.96	1316/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	892/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	12	5	3.87	1256/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	10	6	3.73	1305/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	2	9	3	5	3.58	1005/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	0	2	1	3	2.90	1299/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1340/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	2.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1325/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	108/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	92/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	105/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.59
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	89/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	86/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 308  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	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	21				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 309  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	2	3	10	7	3.87	1372/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	12	5	3.87	1344/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	4	5	7	3.70	1226/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	1083/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	8	10	4.18	715/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	1088/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	12	4.22	950/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	885/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	8	7	6	3.90	1124/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	1199/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	929/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	13	5	4.05	1129/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	1002/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	1025/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	0	2	1	3	2.90	1299/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1340/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	2.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1325/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	108/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	92/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	105/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.59
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	89/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	86/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 309  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 310  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1393/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	719/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	948/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	825/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	724/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	864/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	7	8	4.11	1067/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	805/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1220/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	1092/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1090/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1146/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	5	6	3.50	1379/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	2	3	1	3	2.77	1247/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	3	0	2.75	1314/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	1270/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	115/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	108/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	138/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.42
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	98/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	71/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	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		13				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PETROVA, SILVIY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 311  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1393/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	719/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	948/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	825/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	724/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	864/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	7	8	4.11	1067/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	805/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	616/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	521/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	929/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	977/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1222/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	990/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	3	0	2.75	1314/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	1270/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	115/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	108/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	138/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.42
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	98/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	71/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	13	
			? 0			

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



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 312  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	8	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	1048/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	7	4	4	3.59	1255/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1173/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	826/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1182/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	985/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	909/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	9	4	3.94	1055/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	846/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	699/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	816/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	4	8	3.77	1285/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	0	5	1	6	3.47	1056/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	962/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1081/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	125/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	70/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	53/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	49/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	2	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	52/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 312  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
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	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BECKER, JANNA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 313  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	0	8	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	1048/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	7	4	4	3.59	1255/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1173/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	826/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1182/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	985/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	909/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	704/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	521/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	948/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	586/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1110/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	8	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	962/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1081/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	125/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	70/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	53/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	49/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	2	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	52/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BECKER, JANNA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 313  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
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	16				
				?	2						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 314  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	2	1	1	9	9	4.00	1216/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	0	4	5	10	3.86	1344/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	2	1	3	8	3	3.53	1270/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	3	3	8	3	3.50	1448/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	7	8	3.95	930/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	1	0	5	5	3.40	1328/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	1	5	5	7	3.45	1481/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	909/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	7	5	3.89	1133/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	5	4	11	4.14	1230/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	1150/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	1146/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	4	3	8	3.52	1374/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	3	3	0	4	3	3.08	1174/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	115/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	122/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	89/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	128/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	3	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	73/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	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 16	
			? 2		

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 315  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	2	1	1	9	9	4.00	1216/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	0	4	5	10	3.86	1344/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	2	1	3	8	3	3.53	1270/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	3	3	8	3	3.50	1448/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	7	8	3.95	930/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	1	0	5	5	3.40	1328/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	1	5	5	7	3.45	1481/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	909/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1254/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	3	8	4	3.82	1387/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	1318/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	7	5	3.76	1303/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	3	4	4	3.31	1429/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	10	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1005/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	115/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	122/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	89/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	128/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	3	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	73/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 316  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	6	13	4.45	737/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	4.27	943/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	1057/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	800/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	632/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	823/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	744/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	861/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1220/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	1	9	7	3.95	1316/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	1126/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	3	10	4.10	1104/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	3	5	8	3.65	1333/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	4	0	5	3	1	2.77	1247/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	2.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	68/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	70/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	2	0	11	4.50	120/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	95/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	2	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	73/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 316  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	19				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 317  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	737/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	4.27	943/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	1057/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	800/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	632/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	823/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	744/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	861/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	797/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	933/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1197/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	586/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	1048/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	13	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	2.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	68/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	70/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	2	0	11	4.50	120/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	95/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	2	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	73/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 317  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 318  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	6	12	3	3.65	1490/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	11	4	3.83	1370/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1164/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	7	7	2	3.44	1476/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	6	7	7	3.77	1129/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1134/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1376/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	675/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	10	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	1199/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	1054/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	1027/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	7	6	6	3.71	1309/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1020/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	188/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	178/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	172/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.21
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	197/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	3	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	123/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.18
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 318  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: DAPHNIS, SUZE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 319  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	6	12	3	3.65	1490/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	11	4	3.83	1370/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1164/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	7	7	2	3.44	1476/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	6	7	7	3.77	1129/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1134/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1376/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	675/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	1	9	3	0	2.87	1566/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1401/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1514/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1294/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1317/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	188/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	178/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	172/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.21
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	197/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	3	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	123/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.18
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: DAPHNIS, SUZE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 319  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 320  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	4	6	8	3.95	1280/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	967/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1021/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	6	4	6	3.82	1282/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	743/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	3	8	3.78	1140/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	1	11	3.90	1278/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	922/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	5	5	3	3.64	1323/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	4	2	10	3.85	1374/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	1054/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	3	10	4.00	1146/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	1	11	3.70	1313/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	3	1	1	4	3.00	1179/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1216/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	110/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	85/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	120/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	77/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	39/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		16				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PARK, JOON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 321  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	4	6	8	3.95	1280/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	967/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1021/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	6	4	6	3.82	1282/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	743/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	3	8	3.78	1140/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	1	11	3.90	1278/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	922/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	953/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	971/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	1310/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	876/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	1095/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1099/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1216/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	110/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	85/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	120/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	77/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	39/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		16				
				?	0							



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 322  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	9	7	5	3.73	1458/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	10	4	3.77	1398/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	8	5	3	3.50	1275/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	9	8	2	3.48	1462/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	7	6	3.55	1263/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	7	8	3	3.52	1265/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	10	6	3.95	1206/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	970/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	15	0	3.94	1072/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	1258/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	1354/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	11	7	4.14	1078/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	1009/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	2	6	6	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	6	1	4	3.29	1191/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	5	3	3	3.36	1242/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1130/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	771/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	126/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	8	7	7	3.95	160/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.95
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	176/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.18
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	157/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.05
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	123/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.18
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 322  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, BRIAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 323  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	9	7	5	3.73	1458/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	10	4	3.77	1398/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	8	5	3	3.50	1275/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	9	8	2	3.48	1462/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	7	6	3.55	1263/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	7	8	3	3.52	1265/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	10	6	3.95	1206/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	970/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	1089/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	1391/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	1408/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1120/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1071/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	960/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	6	1	4	3.29	1191/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	5	3	3	3.36	1242/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1130/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	771/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	3.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	126/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	8	7	7	3.95	160/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	3.95
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	176/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.18
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	157/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.05
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	123/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.18
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, BRIAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 323  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 324  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	2	0	5	9	7	3.83	1400/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	7	9	3.95	1258/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	3	9	5	3.94	1101/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	1418/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	796/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1105/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	8	4	5	3.32	1527/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	1082/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	2	4	10	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	2	6	11	4.00	1280/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	2	16	4.39	1333/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	11	6	3.91	1227/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	1309/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	2	5	4	2	3.00	1179/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	2.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1070/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1285/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1221/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	162/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	142/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	114/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	127/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	164/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	3.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 324  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 325  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NA		1	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	5	9	7	3.83	1400/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	7	9	3.95	1258/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	3	9	5	3.94	1101/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	1418/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	796/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1105/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	8	4	5	3.32	1527/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	1082/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	921/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	5	6	7	3.95	1323/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	1310/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	4	8	6	3.95	1200/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	6	5	7	3.89	1236/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	2	2	2	1	2	2.89	1229/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	2.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1070/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1285/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1221/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	162/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	142/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	114/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	127/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	164/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	3.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 325  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0115  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 326  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

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	2	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	1094/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	1070/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1057/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	898/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	1029/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	1182/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	1067/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	1022/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	1	8	2	3.92	1106/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	984/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	1197/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1209/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1204/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1125/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1191/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1167/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	5	1	0	2.86	1325/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	99/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	127/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	107/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	150/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	94/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0115  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 327  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	1094/1670	3.89	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	1070/1666	3.99	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1057/1406	3.77	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	898/1615	3.82	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	1029/1566	3.92	3.87	4.07	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	1182/1528	3.67	3.72	4.12	4.00	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	1067/1650	3.85	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	1022/1667	4.81	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	953/1626	3.82	3.83	4.11	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1378/1559	4.12	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1279/1560	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1361/1549	4.02	4.03	4.31	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1256/1546	3.82	3.92	4.32	4.32	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/1323	3.17	3.65	4.00	3.91	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1191/1384	3.22	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1167/1378	3.26	3.84	4.29	4.09	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	5	1	0	2.86	1325/1378	3.28	3.64	4.31	4.08	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	3.32	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	99/ 232	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	127/ 239	4.23	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	107/ 230	4.47	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	150/ 231	4.28	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	94/ 218	4.37	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	0			

Course-Section: CHEM 124 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 328  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	29	4.94	144/1670	4.94	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	121/1666	4.94	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	240/1406	4.84	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	106/1615	4.95	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	280/1566	4.68	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	221/1528	4.75	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	159/1650	4.90	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	11	4.35	1295/1667	4.35	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	183/1626	4.79	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	111/1559	4.97	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	417/1560	4.93	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	141/1549	4.93	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	162/1546	4.93	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	507/1323	4.31	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	300/1384	4.69	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	481/1378	4.67	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	531/1378	4.67	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	20	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	4.47	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 329  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	1	1	12	4.79	325/1670	4.64	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	280/1666	4.76	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	363/1406	4.65	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	141/1615	4.74	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	118/1566	4.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	221/1528	4.72	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1650	4.59	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	786/1667	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	231/1626	4.41	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	221/1559	4.88	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	4.70	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	161/1549	4.79	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	288/1546	4.65	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	107/1323	4.40	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1049/1384	3.89	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	927/1378	4.21	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	777/1378	4.37	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	4.43	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	36/ 232	4.82	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 239	4.95	4.10	4.21	4.35	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	35/ 230	4.81	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.93
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 231	4.89	4.18	4.31	4.45	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 218	4.98	4.12	4.18	4.47	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 329  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 330  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	1	1	12	4.79	325/1670	4.64	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	280/1666	4.76	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	363/1406	4.65	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	141/1615	4.74	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	118/1566	4.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	221/1528	4.72	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1650	4.59	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	786/1667	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	704/1626	4.41	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	4.88	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1054/1560	4.70	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1549	4.79	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	482/1546	4.65	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	288/1323	4.40	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1049/1384	3.89	3.60	4.10	3.92	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	927/1378	4.21	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	777/1378	4.37	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	4.43	3.79	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	36/ 232	4.82	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 239	4.95	4.10	4.21	4.35	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	35/ 230	4.81	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.93
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 231	4.89	4.18	4.31	4.45	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 218	4.98	4.12	4.18	4.47	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****



Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 330  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 331  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	11	11	4.50	665/1670	4.64	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	344/1666	4.76	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	505/1406	4.65	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	499/1615	4.74	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	280/1566	4.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	285/1528	4.72	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	806/1650	4.59	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1667	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	347/1626	4.41	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	138/1559	4.88	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1560	4.70	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	463/1549	4.79	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	557/1546	4.65	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	560/1323	4.40	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	749/1384	3.89	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	819/1378	4.21	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	786/1378	4.37	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	279/ 904	4.43	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	25/ 232	4.82	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	25/ 239	4.95	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	87/ 230	4.81	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	63/ 231	4.89	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	16/ 218	4.98	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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		21				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 332  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	11	11	4.50	665/1670	4.64	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	344/1666	4.76	3.98	4.27	4.30	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	505/1406	4.65	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	499/1615	4.74	3.79	4.24	4.17	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	280/1566	4.80	3.87	4.07	4.03	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	285/1528	4.72	3.72	4.12	4.00	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	806/1650	4.59	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1667	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	12	4	4.05	926/1626	4.41	3.83	4.11	4.07	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	706/1559	4.88	4.23	4.46	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	1457/1560	4.70	4.44	4.72	4.68	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	622/1549	4.79	4.03	4.31	4.32	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	835/1546	4.65	3.92	4.32	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	9	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	842/1323	4.40	3.65	4.00	3.91	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	749/1384	3.89	3.60	4.10	3.92	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	819/1378	4.21	3.84	4.29	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	786/1378	4.37	3.64	4.31	4.08	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	279/ 904	4.43	3.79	4.03	3.94	4.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	25/ 232	4.82	4.10	4.19	4.25	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	25/ 239	4.95	4.10	4.21	4.35	4.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	87/ 230	4.81	4.35	4.44	4.58	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	63/ 231	4.89	4.18	4.31	4.45	4.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	16/ 218	4.98	4.12	4.18	4.47	4.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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		21				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 333  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	6	5	8	4.11	1162/1670	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	4	4	3.42	1536/1666	3.54	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	6	6	3.58	1257/1406	3.63	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1306/1615	3.74	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	2	9	4.00	851/1566	3.55	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	842/1528	3.93	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	1309/1650	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	7	5	3	3.47	1400/1626	3.65	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	1178/1559	3.97	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1150/1560	4.21	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	5	5	3.56	1377/1549	3.73	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	6	4	3.33	1425/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	6	1	3	3	3.07	1174/1323	3.32	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1216/1384	3.20	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1092/1378	3.80	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1230/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	3	3	5	6	3.82	177/ 232	3.76	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	205/ 239	3.79	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	126/ 230	4.42	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	3	1	9	4	3.82	183/ 231	3.84	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	157/ 218	3.91	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.94

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9							
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General		0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		14				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 334  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	5	8	4.11	1162/1670	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	4	4	3.42	1536/1666	3.54	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	6	6	3.58	1257/1406	3.63	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1306/1615	3.74	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	2	9	4.00	851/1566	3.55	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	842/1528	3.93	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	1309/1650	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	2	8	3	3.63	1335/1626	3.65	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1072/1559	3.97	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	1403/1560	4.21	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1061/1549	3.73	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1391/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	990/1323	3.32	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1216/1384	3.20	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1092/1378	3.80	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1230/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	3	3	5	6	3.82	177/ 232	3.76	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	205/ 239	3.79	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	126/ 230	4.42	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.47	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	3	1	9	4	3.82	183/ 231	3.84	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	157/ 218	3.91	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.94	

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9							
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General		0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		14				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 335  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	8	4.11	1162/1670	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	4	4	3.42	1536/1666	3.54	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	6	6	3.58	1257/1406	3.63	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1306/1615	3.74	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	2	9	4.00	851/1566	3.55	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	842/1528	3.93	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	1309/1650	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	10	1	3.75	1254/1626	3.65	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1092/1559	3.97	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1004/1560	4.21	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	864/1549	3.73	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1232/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1323	3.32	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1216/1384	3.20	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1092/1378	3.80	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1230/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	3	3	5	6	3.82	177/ 232	3.76	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	205/ 239	3.79	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	126/ 230	4.42	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.47	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	3	1	9	4	3.82	183/ 231	3.84	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	157/ 218	3.91	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.94	

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9							
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General		0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		14				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: VAVILAVA, SUMA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 336  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	6	5	8	4.11	1162/1670	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	4	4	3.42	1536/1666	3.54	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	6	6	3.58	1257/1406	3.63	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1306/1615	3.74	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	2	9	4.00	851/1566	3.55	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	842/1528	3.93	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	1309/1650	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	9	6	0	3.40	1438/1626	3.65	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	1143/1559	3.97	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1354/1560	4.21	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	960/1549	3.73	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1369/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1323	3.32	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1216/1384	3.20	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1092/1378	3.80	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1230/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	3	3	5	6	3.82	177/ 232	3.76	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	205/ 239	3.79	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	126/ 230	4.42	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	3	1	9	4	3.82	183/ 231	3.84	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	157/ 218	3.91	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.94

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9							
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General		0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		14				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 337  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	1	7	11	1	3.60	1511/1670	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	7	7	4	3.65	1457/1666	3.54	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	8	3	6	3.68	1230/1406	3.63	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	7	4	4	3.69	1368/1615	3.74	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	6	8	2	3	3.11	1460/1566	3.55	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1146/1528	3.93	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	7	3	8	3.95	1220/1650	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	805/1667	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	3	8	6	3.95	1055/1626	3.65	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	4	10	4.10	1258/1559	3.97	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	7	0	14	4.33	1376/1560	4.21	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	5	5	8	3.81	1285/1549	3.73	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	6	6	3.57	1361/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	2	5	4	2	3.29	1114/1323	3.32	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/1384	3.20	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/1378	3.80	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	190/ 232	3.76	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	165/ 239	3.79	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	145/ 230	4.42	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	179/ 231	3.84	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	170/ 218	3.91	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****



Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 337  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 338  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	1	7	11	1	3.60	1511/1670	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	7	7	4	3.65	1457/1666	3.54	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	8	3	6	3.68	1230/1406	3.63	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	7	4	4	3.69	1368/1615	3.74	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	6	8	2	3	3.11	1460/1566	3.55	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1146/1528	3.93	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	7	3	8	3.95	1220/1650	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	805/1667	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	6	6	5	3.74	1268/1626	3.65	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1408/1559	3.97	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	6	2	6	3.80	1500/1560	4.21	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1459/1549	3.73	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	1469/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/1323	3.32	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/1384	3.20	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/1378	3.80	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	190/ 232	3.76	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	165/ 239	3.79	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	145/ 230	4.42	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	179/ 231	3.84	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	170/ 218	3.91	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 338  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 339  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	1	7	11	1	3.60	1511/1670	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	7	7	4	3.65	1457/1666	3.54	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	8	3	6	3.68	1230/1406	3.63	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	7	4	4	3.69	1368/1615	3.74	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	6	8	2	3	3.11	1460/1566	3.55	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1146/1528	3.93	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	7	3	8	3.95	1220/1650	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	805/1667	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	11	3	3.80	1220/1626	3.65	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1439/1559	3.97	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1487/1560	4.21	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1455/1549	3.73	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1442/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	****/1323	3.32	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/1384	3.20	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/1378	3.80	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	190/ 232	3.76	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	165/ 239	3.79	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	145/ 230	4.42	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	179/ 231	3.84	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	170/ 218	3.91	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 339  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: VAVILAVA, SUMA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 340  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	1	7	11	1	3.60	1511/1670	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	7	7	4	3.65	1457/1666	3.54	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	8	3	6	3.68	1230/1406	3.63	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	7	4	4	3.69	1368/1615	3.74	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	6	8	2	3	3.11	1460/1566	3.55	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1146/1528	3.93	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	7	3	8	3.95	1220/1650	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	805/1667	4.89	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	10	8	1	3.45	1411/1626	3.65	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	2	0	5	1	2	3.10	1515/1559	3.97	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	7	1	5	3.64	1514/1560	4.21	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1471/1549	3.73	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	1473/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1323	3.32	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/1384	3.20	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/1378	3.80	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	190/ 232	3.76	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	165/ 239	3.79	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	145/ 230	4.42	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	179/ 231	3.84	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	170/ 218	3.91	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: VAVILAVA, SUMA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 340  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 302 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 341  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	3	1	9	11	4	3.43	1560/1670	3.43	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	8	6	7	3.39	1546/1666	3.39	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	8	10	3.86	1158/1406	3.86	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1448/1615	3.50	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	4	5	2	4	3	2.83	1520/1566	2.83	3.87	4.07	4.04	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/1528	****	3.72	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	9	3	8	2	3	2	2.61	1619/1650	2.61	4.02	4.22	4.12	2.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	17	4.61	1082/1667	4.61	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	1	13	4	3	3.32	1469/1626	3.32	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	7	9	7	3.84	1378/1559	3.84	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	751/1560	4.84	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	13	4	3	3.16	1474/1549	3.16	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	4	4	7	6	3.28	1436/1546	3.28	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1065/1323	3.44	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****



Course-Section: CHEM 302 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 341  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	16
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	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	26				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101  
 Title PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, ROBER (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 342  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	4	4.17	1094/1670	4.17	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	715/1406	4.40	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1230/1566	3.60	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1534/1626	3.08	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	772/1559	4.60	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.60	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1365/1549	3.70	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1473/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	960/1323	3.58	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.60	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.64	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101  
 Title PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: BUSH, C (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 343  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	4	4.17	1094/1670	4.17	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	715/1406	4.40	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1230/1566	3.60	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1517/1626	3.08	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	772/1559	4.60	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1326/1560	4.60	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1285/1549	3.70	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1273/1546	3.40	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1040/1323	3.58	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.60	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.64	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 344  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	1	3.60	1511/1670	3.60	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1543/1666	3.40	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1418/1615	3.60	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1413/1528	3.20	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	973/1650	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1199/1559	4.35	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1163/1560	4.80	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1489/1549	3.00	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1411/1546	3.70	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1269/1323	2.50	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1193/1378	3.50	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	198/ 232	3.60	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	183/ 239	3.80	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	220/ 230	3.40	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	145/ 231	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	143/ 218	4.00	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 345  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	1	3.60	1511/1670	3.60	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1543/1666	3.40	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1418/1615	3.60	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1413/1528	3.20	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	973/1650	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.35	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.80	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	3.00	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1139/1546	3.70	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1323	2.50	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1193/1378	3.50	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	198/ 232	3.60	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	183/ 239	3.80	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	220/ 230	3.40	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	145/ 231	4.20	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	143/ 218	4.00	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA  
 Enrollment: 227  
 Questionnaires: 105

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 346  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	10	33	58	4.39	822/1670	4.39	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	7	30	64	4.51	608/1666	4.51	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	3	7	35	56	4.39	727/1406	4.39	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	40	2	5	15	21	20	3.83	1282/1615	3.83	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	3	13	33	50	4.28	610/1566	4.28	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	64	0	1	6	13	18	4.26	697/1528	4.26	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	14	21	66	4.46	645/1650	4.46	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	99	4.97	203/1667	4.97	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	1	1	5	31	45	4.42	531/1626	4.42	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	10	86	4.82	403/1559	4.82	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	6	90	4.86	699/1560	4.86	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	1	6	20	67	4.59	586/1549	4.59	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	9	17	70	4.56	655/1546	4.56	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	29	6	2	14	15	28	3.88	842/1323	3.88	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	82	0	2	1	7	5	8	3.70	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	82	0	0	3	4	4	12	4.09	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	84	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	82	16	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	104	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	104	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	104	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	104	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	13	C	21	General	2	Under-grad	105	Non-major	101
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	17	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	77				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 347  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	1	6	11	4.56	611/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	719/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1101/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1009/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	3	8	4.06	820/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	8	4.17	787/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	660/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	9	1	3.69	1294/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1249/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	1340/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	960/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	1009/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	2	3	0	1	2.71	1254/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	740/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	906/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	95/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	114/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	145/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	69/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	102/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.38

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 348  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	1	6	11	4.56	611/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	719/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1101/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1009/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	3	8	4.06	820/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	8	4.17	787/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	660/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	339/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	846/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1004/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	284/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	445/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	990/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	740/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	906/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	95/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	114/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	145/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	69/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	102/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.38

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 349  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	2	1	3.50	1537/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1508/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	1403/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1603/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1348/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1494/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1503/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1438/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1431/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1326/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1431/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1411/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	80/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	191/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	165/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	190/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	143/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
Enrollment: 18  
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Spring 2008

Page 349  
AUG 6, 2008  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 350  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	2	1	3.50	1537/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1508/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	1403/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1603/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1348/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1494/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1503/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1491/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1482/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1504/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1389/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1425/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	80/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	191/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	165/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	190/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	143/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)  
Enrollment: 18  
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Spring 2008

Page 350  
AUG 6, 2008  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 351  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	2	6	4.18	1071/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1496/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	3	4	0	2.90	1373/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1418/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	0	4	3.36	1362/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	733/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1079/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	953/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	1122/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	816/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1232/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	990/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1033/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1247/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1147/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	170/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	147/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	183/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	152/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	170/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 352  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	2	6	4.18	1071/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1496/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	3	4	0	2.90	1373/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1418/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	0	4	3.36	1362/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	733/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1079/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	363/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	598/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1139/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1033/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1247/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1147/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	170/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	147/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	183/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	152/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	170/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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		9				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 353  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	3	9	4.25	996/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	1	5	6	3.63	1470/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	2	4	3.25	1325/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1349/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1246/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1261/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	3	2	6	3.67	1404/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	768/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	910/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	2	2	7	3.79	1401/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	1326/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1146/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	8	4.00	1139/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	2	3	0	2	2.78	1245/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1193/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	147/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	207/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	207/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	222/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	197/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SADLER, JOSH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 354  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	3	9	4.25	996/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	1	5	6	3.63	1470/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	2	4	3.25	1325/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1349/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1246/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1261/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	3	2	6	3.67	1404/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	768/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	0	1	4	2	3.20	1509/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1396/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1538/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1414/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1442/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1193/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	147/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	207/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	207/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	222/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	197/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	1							



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 355  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	6	2	3.82	1407/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1575/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	1	3	1	2.89	1375/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1476/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1397/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	1407/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1376/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1358/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	4	1	3.36	1486/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1431/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	2	1	3.18	1471/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	3	1	3.00	1473/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1248/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1141/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1275/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1230/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	191/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	207/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	189/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.50

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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		9				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 356  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	6	2	3.82	1407/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1575/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	1	3	1	2.89	1375/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1476/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1397/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	1407/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1376/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	531/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	419/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	829/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	749/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	971/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	960/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1141/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1275/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1230/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	191/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	207/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	189/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.50

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 357  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	6	4	3.73	1453/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	2	5	3	3.33	1564/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	7	0	5	0	2	2.29	1399/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	2.85	1592/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1310/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	1233/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1451/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	5	3	2	3.31	1473/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	6	2	5	3.53	1457/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1376/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	3	5	3.73	1317/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	3	0	4	2.73	1513/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	139/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	215/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	152/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	211/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	140/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.08

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 358  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	6	4	3.73	1453/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	2	5	3	3.33	1564/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	7	0	5	0	2	2.29	1399/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	2.85	1592/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1310/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	1233/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1451/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1530/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1408/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1538/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1308/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1139/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	139/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	215/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	152/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	211/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	140/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.08

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 359  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	4	4	3	3.40	1566/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	5	2	3.07	1599/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	2	4	3	1	2.77	1387/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	2	5	3	3.43	1486/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	6	2	3.27	1402/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	5	3	3.33	1521/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	4	2	0	2.60	1589/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1461/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	1446/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	1	6	2	3.21	1467/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	1	6	1	2.93	1491/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1279/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	138/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	199/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	157/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.30
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	114/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	99/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1			
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 360  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	4	4	3	3.40	1566/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	5	2	3.07	1599/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	2	4	3	1	2.77	1387/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	2	5	3	3.43	1486/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	6	2	3.27	1402/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	5	3	3.33	1521/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	670/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1136/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1310/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	952/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1071/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	138/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	199/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	157/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.30
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	114/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	99/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
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	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 361  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	1602/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	0	6	0	2.90	1625/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1405/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	1611/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	2.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	0	7	0	3.10	1460/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	3	2	0	2.44	1509/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1568/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1501/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	1	4	2	3.20	1506/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	0	5	2	3.50	1524/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	1	6	0	3.00	1489/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	2.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	1	3	1	2.78	1509/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	2.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1269/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1314/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1363/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	2.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1356/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	2.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	0	0	4	0	2.71	230/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	2.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	237/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	2.14
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	210/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	227/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	2.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	216/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	1.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****

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	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	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	9				
				? 2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SADLER, JOSH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 362  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	1602/1670	3.83	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	0	6	0	2.90	1625/1666	3.46	3.98	4.27	4.18	2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1405/1406	2.78	3.81	4.32	4.22	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	1611/1615	3.23	3.79	4.24	4.18	2.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	0	7	0	3.10	1460/1566	3.44	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	3	2	0	2.44	1509/1528	3.43	3.72	4.12	4.07	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1568/1650	3.66	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	5	2	0	2.89	1563/1626	3.64	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	1529/1559	3.85	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1558/1560	4.15	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	1	2	1	2.63	1520/1549	3.79	4.03	4.31	4.25	2.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	1531/1546	3.55	3.92	4.32	4.24	2.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1323	3.00	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1314/1384	3.50	3.60	4.10	4.12	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1363/1378	3.29	3.84	4.29	4.30	2.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1356/1378	3.40	3.64	4.31	4.33	2.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	0	0	4	0	2.71	230/ 232	4.05	4.10	4.19	4.04	2.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	237/ 239	3.61	4.10	4.21	3.99	2.14
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	210/ 230	4.07	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	227/ 231	3.90	4.18	4.31	4.11	2.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	216/ 218	3.67	4.12	4.18	3.93	1.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****

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	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	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	9				
				? 2						



Course-Section: CHEM 352 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH  
 Enrollment: 161  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 363  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	6	11	25	4.45	737/1670	4.39	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	14	24	4.45	703/1666	4.30	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	15	23	4.45	656/1406	4.34	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	944/1615	4.40	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	5	7	24	4.46	440/1566	4.48	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	787/1528	4.03	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	12	25	4.43	690/1650	4.45	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	203/1667	4.93	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	3	8	25	4.54	371/1626	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	34	4.83	403/1559	4.58	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	477/1560	4.86	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	16	23	4.51	670/1549	4.22	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	28	4.51	703/1546	4.19	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	2	2	6	3	13	3.88	834/1323	3.97	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	17							
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General		2	Under-grad	42	Non-major	40
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	10	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		35				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK  
 Enrollment: 156  
 Questionnaires: 106

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 364  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	3	12	25	62	4.33	902/1670	4.39	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	14	35	48	4.14	1092/1666	4.30	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	14	36	49	4.22	908/1406	4.34	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	44	0	1	2	17	40	4.60	446/1615	4.40	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	1	10	21	62	4.49	399/1566	4.48	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	54	2	4	11	13	20	3.90	1039/1528	4.03	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	10	30	62	4.46	630/1650	4.45	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	10	93	4.88	712/1667	4.93	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	1	2	16	36	33	4.11	888/1626	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	10	31	57	4.34	1092/1559	4.58	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	2	8	91	4.79	892/1560	4.86	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	6	21	30	40	3.92	1218/1549	4.22	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	10	13	28	44	3.87	1244/1546	4.19	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	3	8	14	19	44	4.06	674/1323	3.97	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	82	0	2	1	2	6	13	4.13	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	1	0	5	4	15	4.28	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	1	0	3	5	16	4.40	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	81	0	1	2	1	3	18	4.40	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	99	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	99	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.10	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	99	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 230	****	4.35	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	99	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/ 231	****	4.18	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	99	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.12	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 32	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 39		Graduate 0
56-83	31	2.00-2.99 6	C 15	General	0
84-150	26	3.00-3.49 27	D 0		Under-grad 106
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 32	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	92
			? 6		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 365  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	2	3	2	3.56	1524/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1199/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1206/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1448/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	851/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1347/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1240/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1360/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	1205/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1246/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1398/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1155/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	115/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	131/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	165/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	159/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	143/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 366  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	2	3	2	3.56	1524/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1199/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1206/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1448/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	851/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1347/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1143/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1280/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1310/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1270/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1473/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	115/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	131/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	165/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	159/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	143/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 367  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	10	4.69	440/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	582/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	836/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	552/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	589/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	769/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	645/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	831/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	673/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	646/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	679/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	692/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	80/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	131/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	165/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	92/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	135/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
Enrollment: 16  
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Spring 2008

Page 367  
AUG 6, 2008  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
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 352L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: XIE, MIN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 368  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	10	4.69	440/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	582/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	836/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	552/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	589/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	769/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	645/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	6	1	1	2.91	1561/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1461/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1524/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	4	0	2	3.13	1480/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1473/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	80/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	131/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	165/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	92/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	135/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: XIE, MIN (Instr. B)  
Enrollment: 16  
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Spring 2008

Page 368  
AUG 6, 2008  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
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 352L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 369  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	2	8	6	3.89	1358/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	1474/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	0	4	4	2	3.15	1337/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	1368/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	5	8	3.83	1078/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	5	5	5	3.65	1212/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	3	1	8	3.75	1359/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	0	16	4.76	909/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1072/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	1249/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1090/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	5	4	5	3.44	1414/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1379/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	5	2	6	3.56	1010/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	141/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	140/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	186/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.06
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	2	4	1	8	3.81	185/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	143/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 370  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	2	8	6	3.89	1358/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	1474/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	0	4	4	2	3.15	1337/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	1368/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	5	8	3.83	1078/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	5	5	5	3.65	1212/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	3	1	8	3.75	1359/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	0	16	4.76	909/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	6	4	3	3.40	1438/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1499/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1427/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	2	0	5	0	3.13	1480/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1473/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	141/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	140/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	186/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.06
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	2	4	1	8	3.81	185/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	143/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 371  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	1372/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	5	3.80	1383/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	1164/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	2	5	4	3.57	1427/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1159/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	3	3	3.40	1328/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1539/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	540/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	953/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1042/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1222/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1116/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1064/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	3	1	3	6	3.92	794/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1171/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1156/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1086/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	878/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	53/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	105/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	201/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	214/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	196/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.33

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 372  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	1372/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	5	3.80	1383/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	1164/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	2	5	4	3.57	1427/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1159/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	3	3	3.40	1328/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1539/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	540/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1384/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	1482/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	1540/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1489/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1465/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1171/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1156/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1086/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	878/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	53/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	105/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	201/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	214/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	196/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.33

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 373  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	1	5	7	3.94	1305/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	1048/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	5	2	4	3.62	1247/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	981/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	706/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1025/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	720/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	953/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	896/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	829/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	1036/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	1139/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	864/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	147/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	177/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.87
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	182/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	145/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	121/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 374  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1305/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	1048/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	5	2	4	3.62	1247/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	981/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	706/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1025/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	720/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	704/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	896/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	1163/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	1027/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	1	0	1	5	3.67	1329/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1241/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	147/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	177/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.87
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	182/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	145/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	121/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		11				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 375  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	3	7	3.94	1292/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1199/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1021/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	687/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	962/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	814/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	926/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1089/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	1249/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	673/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1200/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	1002/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	692/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	136/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.12
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	125/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	177/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.18
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	153/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	105/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.35

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	9	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		13				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: XIE, MIN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 376  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	6	3	7	3.94	1292/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1199/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1021/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	687/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	962/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	814/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	926/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	8	2	1	3.15	1519/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1431/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1467/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1369/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1293/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	136/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.12
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	125/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	177/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.18
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	153/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	105/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.35

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	9	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		13				
				?	1							



Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 377  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	1	2	1	8	4	3.75	1442/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	10	0	3.44	1532/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	1301/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1467/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	978/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	847/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1293/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	472/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	6	8	0	3.38	1448/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	3	4	6	3.81	1391/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1138/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	2	3	6	1	3.00	1489/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	3	3	4	3.13	1465/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1000/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	820/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	718/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1165/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	214/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	213/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	188/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	210/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	185/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	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	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 378  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	1	2	1	8	4	3.75	1442/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	10	0	3.44	1532/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	1301/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1467/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	978/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	847/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1293/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	472/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	8	6	1	3.38	1448/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1337/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	3	4	4	2	3.21	1542/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1351/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	2	4	2	2.93	1491/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1167/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	820/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	718/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1165/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	214/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	213/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	188/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	210/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	185/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	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		15				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 379  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	5	3.93	1305/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	8	5	4.00	1199/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1131/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	944/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	6	2	5	3.92	978/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	899/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1101/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	483/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	858/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	855/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	646/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	768/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	781/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	162/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	113/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	114/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	127/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	127/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 380  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	7	5	3.93	1305/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	8	5	4.00	1199/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1131/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	944/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	6	2	5	3.92	978/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	899/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1101/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1240/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1280/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1457/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	936/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1009/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	612/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	162/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	113/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	114/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	127/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	127/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 381  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1060/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	784/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1147/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	837/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	851/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1222/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	973/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	563/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	521/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1389/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	570/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	590/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	102/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	100/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	111/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	90/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	5	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	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 382  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1060/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	784/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1147/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	837/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	851/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1222/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	973/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	324/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	715/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	102/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	100/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	111/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	90/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	5	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	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 383  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	1	3	3	4.00	1216/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	622/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	751/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	775/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	631/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	903/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	693/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	896/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	570/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	64/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	70/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	99/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	7
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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 384  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	1	3	3	4.00	1216/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	622/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	751/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	775/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	631/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	903/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	531/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1092/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	488/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	715/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	423/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	64/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	70/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	99/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	7
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		8				
				?	0							



Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 385  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	1	5	4	3.83	1393/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1452/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1291/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1418/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1010/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1328/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1359/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1152/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	1382/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1090/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	1322/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1329/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	0	2	4	3.78	908/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	168/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	147/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	3	0	1	5	3.89	200/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	120/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	186/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.57

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: BROWN, ANDREW (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 386  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	1	5	4	3.83	1393/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1452/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1291/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1418/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1010/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1328/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1359/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1172/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1382/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1376/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1270/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	849/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1269/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	168/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	147/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	3	0	1	5	3.89	200/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	3.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	120/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	186/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.57

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 387  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	4	4	2	3.64	1498/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1525/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1321/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1561/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	3	1	3.36	1362/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	1536/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1416/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1439/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1126/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	4	1	3.36	1438/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1455/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	936/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	129/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	215/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	92/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	86/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	143/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	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		1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
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		5				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 388  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	4	4	2	3.64	1498/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1525/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1321/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1561/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	3	1	3.36	1362/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	1536/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1448/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1280/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1438/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1270/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1458/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1248/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	129/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	215/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	92/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	86/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	143/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	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		1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
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		5				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 389  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	4	2	7	4.23	1017/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	967/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	763/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1312/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	808/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1025/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	844/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	379/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	673/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	751/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	977/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	8	4.25	987/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	656/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1070/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1125/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1130/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	97/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	98/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	112/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	124/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	99/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 390  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	2	7	4.23	1017/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	967/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	763/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1312/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	808/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1025/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	844/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	403/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1256/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	855/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1104/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1032/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1070/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1125/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1130/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	97/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	98/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	112/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	124/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	99/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 391  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	3	2	3.75	1442/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1331/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1142/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1312/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1257/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1345/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1404/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	1119/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1282/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	1092/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1457/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1299/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	1366/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1125/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1231/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1228/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1230/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	794/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	212/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	187/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	132/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	195/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	180/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	74/ 87	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.30	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
Enrollment: 14  
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Spring 2008

Page 391  
AUG 6, 2008  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 392  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	2	3	2	3.75	1442/1670	3.94	4.00	4.31	4.24	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1331/1666	3.98	3.98	4.27	4.18	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1142/1406	3.81	3.81	4.32	4.22	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1312/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.18	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1257/1566	3.96	3.87	4.07	4.04	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1345/1528	3.75	3.72	4.12	4.07	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1404/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	1119/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	953/1626	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.06	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1218/1559	4.10	4.23	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1538/1560	4.42	4.44	4.72	4.67	3.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1443/1549	3.85	4.03	4.31	4.25	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1507/1546	3.77	3.92	4.32	4.24	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1259/1323	3.62	3.65	4.00	3.99	2.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1231/1384	3.52	3.60	4.10	4.12	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1228/1378	3.78	3.84	4.29	4.30	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1230/1378	3.63	3.64	4.31	4.33	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	794/ 904	2.63	3.79	4.03	4.03	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	212/ 232	4.11	4.10	4.19	4.04	3.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	187/ 239	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.99	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	132/ 230	4.31	4.35	4.44	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	195/ 231	4.18	4.18	4.31	4.11	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	180/ 218	4.03	4.12	4.18	3.93	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	74/ 87	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.30	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
Enrollment: 14  
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Spring 2008

Page 392  
AUG 6, 2008  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 401 0101  
 Title CHEM/STAT THERMODYNAMI  
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 393  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	4	5	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	719/1666	4.44	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	423/1406	4.67	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1276/1615	3.83	3.79	4.24	4.37	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	470/1566	4.43	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.88	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	877/1626	4.13	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1157/1559	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.58	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.44	4.72	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1087/1549	4.13	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	715/1546	4.50	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	990/1323	3.60	3.65	4.00	4.10	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	356/1384	4.63	3.60	4.10	4.32	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	860/1378	4.25	3.84	4.29	4.55	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	977/1378	4.00	3.64	4.31	4.60	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	779/ 904	3.33	3.79	4.03	4.22	3.33

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

Course-Section: CHEM 406 0101  
 Title BIOINORGANIC CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 394  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	4	5	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	667/1406	4.44	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1615	4.56	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	389/1566	4.50	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	560/1528	4.40	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	938/1650	4.22	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	897/1667	4.78	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1626	4.38	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.23	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.44	4.72	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546	4.78	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	3.65	4.00	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 431 0101  
 Title CHEMISTRY OF PROTEINS  
 Instructor: GARVIE, COLIN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 395  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.71	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	529/1666	4.57	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	691/1406	4.43	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	633/1615	4.44	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	589/1566	4.30	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	823/1528	4.13	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	383/1650	4.64	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	278/1626	4.67	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	221/1559	4.93	4.23	4.46	4.58	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.44	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	288/1546	4.86	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	217/1323	4.69	3.65	4.00	4.10	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.19	4.35	****

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	3	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General		9	Under-grad	11	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2							
				I	0	Other		4				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 396  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1670	4.85	4.00	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	173/1666	4.72	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	459/1406	4.36	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	412/1615	4.78	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	470/1566	4.30	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1528	4.72	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	395/1650	4.74	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1626	4.21	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.23	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.44	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	181/1549	4.88	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	208/1546	4.88	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	235/1323	4.54	3.65	4.00	4.10	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	4.33	3.60	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1378	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1378	4.33	3.64	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	30/ 232	4.77	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	36/ 239	4.82	4.10	4.21	4.26	4.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	44/ 230	4.82	4.35	4.44	4.30	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 231	4.95	4.18	4.31	4.24	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	26/ 218	4.77	4.12	4.18	4.09	4.91

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 397  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1670	4.85	4.00	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	173/1666	4.72	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	459/1406	4.36	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	412/1615	4.78	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	470/1566	4.30	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1528	4.72	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	395/1650	4.74	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1427/1626	4.21	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	5.00	4.23	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	5.00	4.44	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	4.88	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	4.88	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1323	4.54	3.65	4.00	4.10	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	4.33	3.60	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1378	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1378	4.33	3.64	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	30/ 232	4.77	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	36/ 239	4.82	4.10	4.21	4.26	4.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	44/ 230	4.82	4.35	4.44	4.30	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 231	4.95	4.18	4.31	4.24	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	26/ 218	4.77	4.12	4.18	4.09	4.91

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 398  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	4	9	4.69	440/1670	4.85	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	582/1666	4.72	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1015/1406	4.36	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	141/1615	4.78	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	734/1566	4.30	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	398/1528	4.72	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1650	4.74	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1626	4.21	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.23	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.44	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1549	4.88	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	299/1546	4.88	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	413/1323	4.54	3.65	4.00	4.10	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	608/1384	4.33	3.60	4.10	4.32	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	813/1378	4.33	3.64	4.31	4.60	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	51/ 232	4.77	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	36/ 239	4.82	4.10	4.21	4.26	4.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	81/ 230	4.82	4.35	4.44	4.30	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	40/ 231	4.95	4.18	4.31	4.24	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	57/ 218	4.77	4.12	4.18	4.09	4.64

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: DAVIS, SONNET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 399  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	4	9	4.69	440/1670	4.85	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	582/1666	4.72	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1015/1406	4.36	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	141/1615	4.78	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	734/1566	4.30	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	398/1528	4.72	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1650	4.74	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1384/1626	4.21	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	5.00	4.23	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	5.00	4.44	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	4.88	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	4.88	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	4.54	3.65	4.00	4.10	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	608/1384	4.33	3.60	4.10	4.32	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	813/1378	4.33	3.64	4.31	4.60	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	51/ 232	4.77	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	36/ 239	4.82	4.10	4.21	4.26	4.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	81/ 230	4.82	4.35	4.44	4.30	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	40/ 231	4.95	4.18	4.31	4.24	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	57/ 218	4.77	4.12	4.18	4.09	4.64

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 400  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	1	6	13	18	4.26	985/1670	4.26	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	20	10	3.88	1337/1666	3.88	3.98	4.27	4.35	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	10	18	8	3.70	1226/1406	3.70	3.81	4.32	4.48	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	1	7	8	9	3.88	1246/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.37	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	2	3	12	15	3.97	898/1566	3.97	3.87	4.07	4.17	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	3	2	11	9	3.92	1011/1528	3.92	3.72	4.12	4.26	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	4	18	12	3.95	1220/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	203/1667	4.97	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	3	3	11	17	4.06	926/1626	3.40	3.83	4.11	4.28	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	34	4.82	403/1559	4.17	4.23	4.46	4.58	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	33	4.78	911/1560	4.49	4.44	4.72	4.80	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	11	19	4.07	1116/1549	3.58	4.03	4.31	4.43	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	2	33	4.55	655/1546	3.92	3.92	4.32	4.43	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	6	2	2	1	10	3.33	1099/1323	3.46	3.65	4.00	4.10	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General		1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	40
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	4	D	1							
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		34				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 401  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	1	6	13	18	4.26	985/1670	4.26	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	20	10	3.88	1337/1666	3.88	3.98	4.27	4.35	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	10	18	8	3.70	1226/1406	3.70	3.81	4.32	4.48	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	1	7	8	9	3.88	1246/1615	3.88	3.79	4.24	4.37	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	2	3	12	15	3.97	898/1566	3.97	3.87	4.07	4.17	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	3	2	11	9	3.92	1011/1528	3.92	3.72	4.12	4.26	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	4	18	12	3.95	1220/1650	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.28	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	203/1667	4.97	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	7	7	12	8	2	2.75	1579/1626	3.40	3.83	4.11	4.28	3.40
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	4	9	17	5	3.51	1459/1559	4.17	4.23	4.46	4.58	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	5	16	16	4.21	1421/1560	4.49	4.44	4.72	4.80	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	10	12	4	3.08	1484/1549	3.58	4.03	4.31	4.43	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	3	10	8	10	3.29	1436/1546	3.92	3.92	4.32	4.43	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	6	6	6	13	3.59	1000/1323	3.46	3.65	4.00	4.10	3.46
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General		1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	40
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	4	D	1							
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		34				
				?	2							

Course-Section: CHEM 455 0101  
 Title INTRO BIOMEDICINAL CHE  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 402  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	36	4.77	350/1670	4.77	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	10	31	4.65	428/1666	4.65	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	11	28	4.53	566/1406	4.53	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	1	6	32	4.63	412/1615	4.63	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	4	7	24	4.37	530/1566	4.37	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	250/1528	4.73	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	11	31	4.70	327/1650	4.70	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	18	21	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	4	32	4.74	215/1626	4.74	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	35	4.81	435/1559	4.81	4.23	4.46	4.58	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	39	4.93	477/1560	4.93	4.44	4.72	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	36	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	37	4.88	265/1546	4.88	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	1	7	26	4.66	242/1323	4.66	3.65	4.00	4.10	4.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1384	****	3.60	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1378	****	3.84	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1378	****	3.64	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.79	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 2 Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 13	Under-grad 42 Non-major 34
84-150	18	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 403  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	3	4	4.11	1150/1670	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1199/1666	4.25	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	799/1406	4.25	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1018/1615	4.14	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1285/1566	3.75	3.87	4.07	4.17	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.61	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	938/1650	4.19	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	712/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	831/1626	4.28	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	486/1559	4.89	4.23	4.46	4.58	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	1205/1560	4.69	4.44	4.72	4.80	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1095/1549	4.39	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1009/1546	4.36	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	384/1323	4.31	3.65	4.00	4.10	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.13	3.60	4.10	4.32	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.84	4.29	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	653/1378	4.75	3.64	4.31	4.60	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.83	3.79	4.03	4.22	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	180/ 232	3.78	4.10	4.19	4.35	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	226/ 239	3.73	4.10	4.21	4.26	3.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	214/ 230	3.93	4.35	4.44	4.30	3.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	224/ 231	3.13	4.18	4.31	4.24	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	200/ 218	3.10	4.12	4.18	4.09	3.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 404  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	622/1666	4.25	3.98	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	948/1406	4.25	3.81	4.32	4.48	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	972/1615	4.14	3.79	4.24	4.37	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	851/1566	3.75	3.87	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	421/1528	4.61	3.72	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1008/1650	4.19	4.02	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	4.28	3.83	4.11	4.28	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	4.89	4.23	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560	4.69	4.44	4.72	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.39	4.03	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	715/1546	4.36	3.92	4.32	4.43	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	612/1323	4.31	3.65	4.00	4.10	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1103/1384	4.13	3.60	4.10	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.84	4.29	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.75	3.64	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	461/ 904	3.83	3.79	4.03	4.22	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	184/ 232	3.78	4.10	4.19	4.35	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	131/ 239	3.73	4.10	4.21	4.26	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	165/ 230	3.93	4.35	4.44	4.30	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	216/ 231	3.13	4.18	4.31	4.24	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	201/ 218	3.10	4.12	4.18	4.09	3.00

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