

Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101  
 Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 227  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	928/1576	4.28	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	462/1576	4.61	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	658/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	218/1520	4.79	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	594/1434	4.33	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	339/1547	4.67	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	871/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	568/1488	4.72	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	500/1489	4.67	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	170/1277	4.73	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	381/1279	4.60	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	559/1270	4.60	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	400/ 878	4.20	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 2	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 228  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	13	12	13	3.64	1396/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	15	10	7	3.14	1509/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	6	9	9	15	3	3.00	1294/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	10	10	11	2	2.97	1472/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	5	10	6	10	3.68	1159/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	5	2	5	9	2	3.04	1372/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	5	8	14	10	3.58	1316/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	5	9	23	4.49	1103/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	4	4	19	4	1	2.81	1499/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	6	6	4	10	13	3.46	1395/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	4	5	2	11	19	3.88	1443/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	9	7	9	7	6	2.84	1448/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	9	10	5	10	6	2.85	1445/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	13	5	5	6	0	2.14	1264/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	1	6	9	9	3.38	1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	3	7	7	10	3.44	1149/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	8	5	6	6	7	2.97	1218/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	768/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 228  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	12	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 229  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	13	12	13	3.64	1396/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	15	10	7	3.14	1509/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	6	9	9	15	3	3.00	1294/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	10	10	11	2	2.97	1472/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	5	10	6	10	3.68	1159/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	5	2	5	9	2	3.04	1372/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	5	8	14	10	3.58	1316/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	5	9	23	4.49	1103/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	4	2	18	7	1	2.97	1462/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	0	6	7	12	4.00	1233/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	1263/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	4	0	10	3	8	3.44	1349/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	2	9	4	6	3.33	1363/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	2	5	4	1	3	7	3.15	1131/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	1	6	9	9	3.38	1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	3	7	7	10	3.44	1149/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	8	5	6	6	7	2.97	1218/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	768/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 229  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	12	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 230  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	13	12	13	3.64	1396/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	15	10	7	3.14	1509/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	6	9	9	15	3	3.00	1294/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	10	10	11	2	2.97	1472/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	5	10	6	10	3.68	1159/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	5	2	5	9	2	3.04	1372/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	5	8	14	10	3.58	1316/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	5	9	23	4.49	1103/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	9	13	9	4.00	924/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	920/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	1210/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	871/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	1	4	2	11	4.11	1065/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	4	1	3	0	2	6	3.75	889/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	1	6	9	9	3.38	1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	3	7	7	10	3.44	1149/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	8	5	6	6	7	2.97	1218/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	768/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 230  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	12	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 231  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	13	12	13	3.64	1396/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	15	10	7	3.14	1509/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	6	9	9	15	3	3.00	1294/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	10	10	11	2	2.97	1472/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	5	10	6	10	3.68	1159/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	5	2	5	9	2	3.04	1372/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	5	8	14	10	3.58	1316/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	5	9	23	4.49	1103/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	8	12	11	4.10	876/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	920/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	1210/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	871/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	1	4	2	11	4.11	1065/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	4	1	3	0	2	6	3.75	889/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	1	6	9	9	3.38	1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	3	7	7	10	3.44	1149/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	8	5	6	6	7	2.97	1218/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	768/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 231  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	12	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 232  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	12	14	11	6	3.06	1532/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	15	10	10	3	2.64	1561/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	11	10	17	4	4	2.57	1335/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	8	3	10	7	2	2.73	1501/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	7	10	10	5	3.08	1372/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	15	8	7	6	6	1	2.46	1419/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	12	7	15	4	3.02	1457/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	1202/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	13	7	8	8	0	2.31	1539/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	5	6	12	8	13	3.41	1406/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	7	11	23	4.28	1348/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	9	11	11	6	6	2.74	1455/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	4	12	6	8	7	7	2.78	1453/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	12	11	1	7	7	3	2.66	1221/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	12	10	11	3.55	1043/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	4	10	7	16	3.66	1095/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	10	8	10	3.31	1172/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	5	3	8	13	3.90	557/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 232  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
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	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 233  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	12	14	11	6	3.06	1532/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	15	10	10	3	2.64	1561/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	11	10	17	4	4	2.57	1335/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	8	3	10	7	2	2.73	1501/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	7	10	10	5	3.08	1372/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	15	8	7	6	6	1	2.46	1419/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	12	7	15	4	3.02	1457/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	1202/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	4	11	17	2	3.50	1303/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	5	5	14	4.28	1087/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	2	1	6	18	4.48	1225/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	4	6	8	8	3.77	1249/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	2	9	6	6	3.48	1319/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	5	1	3	3	7	4	3.56	997/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	12	10	11	3.55	1043/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	4	10	7	16	3.66	1095/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	10	8	10	3.31	1172/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	5	3	8	13	3.90	557/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 233  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 13	General 0	Under-grad 47 Non-major 46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other 26	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 234  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	12	14	11	6	3.06	1532/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	15	10	10	3	2.64	1561/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	11	10	17	4	4	2.57	1335/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	8	3	10	7	2	2.73	1501/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	7	10	10	5	3.08	1372/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	15	8	7	6	6	1	2.46	1419/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	12	7	15	4	3.02	1457/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	1202/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	4	18	12	4.17	794/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	995/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	1041/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	806/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	976/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	9	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	916/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	12	10	11	3.55	1043/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	4	10	7	16	3.66	1095/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	10	8	10	3.31	1172/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	5	3	8	13	3.90	557/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 234  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
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	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 235  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	12	14	11	6	3.06	1532/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	15	10	10	3	2.64	1561/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	11	10	17	4	4	2.57	1335/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	8	3	10	7	2	2.73	1501/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	7	10	10	5	3.08	1372/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	15	8	7	6	6	1	2.46	1419/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	12	7	15	4	3.02	1457/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	1202/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	3	5	20	6	3.85	1096/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	1025/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	1125/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	0	4	7	12	4.21	996/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	1042/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	9	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	953/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	12	10	11	3.55	1043/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	4	10	7	16	3.66	1095/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	10	8	10	3.31	1172/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	5	3	8	13	3.90	557/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 235  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
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	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 236  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	3	13	16	5	3.42	1474/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	6	9	10	12	4	2.98	1529/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	8	10	9	8	4	2.74	1324/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	3	9	4	8	3	2.96	1475/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	6	6	11	11	3.64	1187/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1370/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	5	8	13	10	4	3.00	1459/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	866/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	9	7	10	7	0	2.45	1528/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	4	2	9	11	14	3.72	1359/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	5	4	4	15	12	3.63	1465/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	7	14	6	8	5	2.75	1455/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	17	5	4	7	6	2.49	1467/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	13	6	4	8	2	2.39	1248/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	4	9	12	3.61	1022/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	3	4	7	13	3.71	1075/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	7	11	4	3.13	1203/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	2	2	5	7	10	3.81	603/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.81	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 236  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 237  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	3	13	16	5	3.42	1474/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	6	9	10	12	4	2.98	1529/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	8	10	9	8	4	2.74	1324/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	3	9	4	8	3	2.96	1475/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	6	6	11	11	3.64	1187/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1370/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	5	8	13	10	4	3.00	1459/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	866/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	1	13	11	2	3.52	1299/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	2	2	7	12	4.26	1103/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	1291/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	3	1	4	7	6	3.57	1313/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	2	2	10	4	3.74	1262/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	3	2	1	4	5	7	3.74	902/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	4	9	12	3.61	1022/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	3	4	7	13	3.71	1075/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	7	11	4	3.13	1203/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	2	2	5	7	10	3.81	603/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.81	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 237  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 238  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	6	0	3	3	13	16	5	3.42	1474/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	6	9	10	12	4	2.98	1529/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	8	10	9	8	4	2.74	1324/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	3	9	4	8	3	2.96	1475/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	6	6	11	11	3.64	1187/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1370/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	5	8	13	10	4	3.00	1459/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	866/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	0	1	17	7	4.24	732/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	1087/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	1331/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1054/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	888/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	3	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	928/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	4	9	12	3.61	1022/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	3	4	7	13	3.71	1075/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	7	11	4	3.13	1203/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	2	2	5	7	10	3.81	603/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 238  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 239  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	3	13	16	5	3.42	1474/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	6	9	10	12	4	2.98	1529/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	8	10	9	8	4	2.74	1324/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	3	9	4	8	3	2.96	1475/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	6	6	11	11	3.64	1187/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1370/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	5	8	13	10	4	3.00	1459/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	866/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	0	0	0	14	10	4.42	518/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	970/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	1331/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	1010/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	888/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	3	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	916/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	4	9	12	3.61	1022/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	3	4	7	13	3.71	1075/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	7	11	4	3.13	1203/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	2	2	5	7	10	3.81	603/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.81	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 239  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 240  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	5	11	3.75	1345/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	10	3	7	3.18	1501/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	6	5	4	9	3.29	1263/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	4	3	10	5	3.61	1330/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	4	6	6	3.39	1295/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	2	5	3	2	3.07	1366/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	8	9	3.63	1294/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	1063/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	3	2	8	2	2	2.88	1488/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	2	8	6	8	3.52	1386/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	8	5	12	3.93	1435/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	6	9	6	2	2.85	1448/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	8	3	6	2	2.54	1464/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	9	2	5	3	3	2.50	1238/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	7	2	9	3.38	1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	2	5	2	10	3.42	1153/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	2	7	1	9	3.39	1145/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	440/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	186/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 240  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 241  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	5	11	3.75	1345/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	10	3	7	3.18	1501/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	6	5	4	9	3.29	1263/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	4	3	10	5	3.61	1330/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	4	6	6	3.39	1295/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	2	5	3	2	3.07	1366/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	8	9	3.63	1294/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	1063/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	5	10	2	3.63	1247/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	846/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	1017/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	981/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1118/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	2	0	0	3	11	4.31	480/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	7	2	9	3.38	1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	2	5	2	10	3.42	1153/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	2	7	1	9	3.39	1145/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	440/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	186/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.00

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 241  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 242  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	5	11	3.75	1345/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	10	3	7	3.18	1501/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	6	5	4	9	3.29	1263/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	4	3	10	5	3.61	1330/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	4	6	6	3.39	1295/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	2	5	3	2	3.07	1366/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	8	9	3.63	1294/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	1063/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	871/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	638/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1113/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	607/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	888/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	347/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	7	2	9	3.38	1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	2	5	2	10	3.42	1153/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	2	7	1	9	3.39	1145/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	440/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	186/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 242  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 243  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	3	16	13	11	3.68	1374/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	7	14	12	7	3.25	1484/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	6	4	12	13	8	3.30	1259/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	14	0	6	9	7	6	3.46	1377/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	6	1	5	4	12	13	3.89	1004/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	19	3	1	8	5	5	3.36	1278/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	6	5	14	6	10	3.22	1420/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	0	0	4	15	20	4.41	1189/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	4	5	13	4	4	2.97	1462/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	5	12	11	14	3.68	1365/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	2	4	5	12	20	4.02	1409/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	7	10	10	9	8	3.02	1419/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	4	10	5	9	6	9	2.97	1422/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	5	10	8	4	7	2.94	1176/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	2	6	8	15	3.80	938/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	2	7	4	19	3.97	951/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	11	6	12	3.65	1073/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	4	1	5	5	13	3.79	614/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 48	Non-major 48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 28		
				? 2			



Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 244  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	3	16	13	11	3.68	1374/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	7	14	12	7	3.25	1484/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	6	4	12	13	8	3.30	1259/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	14	0	6	9	7	6	3.46	1377/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	6	1	5	4	12	13	3.89	1004/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	19	3	1	8	5	5	3.36	1278/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	6	5	14	6	10	3.22	1420/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	0	0	4	15	20	4.41	1189/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	0	0	0	18	6	3	3.44	1331/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	1	5	6	10	4.00	1233/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	1	2	3	5	14	4.16	1384/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	2	2	7	3	5	3.37	1369/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	2	2	4	3	4	5	3.33	1363/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	3	3	1	6	2	4	3.19	1123/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	2	6	8	15	3.80	938/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	2	7	4	19	3.97	951/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	11	6	12	3.65	1073/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	4	1	5	5	13	3.79	614/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.79	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 9	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 48
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 48
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Electives 0
					Other 28

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 245  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	3	16	13	11	3.68	1374/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	7	14	12	7	3.25	1484/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	6	4	12	13	8	3.30	1259/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	14	0	6	9	7	6	3.46	1377/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	6	1	5	4	12	13	3.89	1004/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	19	3	1	8	5	5	3.36	1278/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	6	5	14	6	10	3.22	1420/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	0	0	4	15	20	4.41	1189/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	395/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	1111/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	849/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	1003/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1042/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	5	0	2	5	0	3	3.40	****/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	2	6	8	15	3.80	938/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	2	7	4	19	3.97	951/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	11	6	12	3.65	1073/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	4	1	5	5	13	3.79	614/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 48	Non-major 48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 28		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 246  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	3	16	13	11	3.68	1374/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	7	14	12	7	3.25	1484/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	6	4	12	13	8	3.30	1259/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	14	0	6	9	7	6	3.46	1377/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	6	1	5	4	12	13	3.89	1004/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	19	3	1	8	5	5	3.36	1278/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	6	5	14	6	10	3.22	1420/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	0	0	4	15	20	4.41	1189/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	1	10	9	6	3.77	1159/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	1155/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	1029/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	1	1	7	1	5	3.53	1323/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	4	2	4	5	3.67	1283/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	5	1	1	5	0	3	3.30	****/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	2	6	8	15	3.80	938/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	2	7	4	19	3.97	951/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	11	6	12	3.65	1073/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	4	1	5	5	13	3.79	614/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 9	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 48
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 48
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Other 28

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 247  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	13	9	3.70	1370/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	9	12	10	3.85	1270/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	5	13	10	3.97	1010/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1271/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	8	7	10	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	7	5	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	999/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	720/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	5	9	6	1	3.05	1441/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	5	5	8	6	7	3.16	1438/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	4	3	23	4.44	1263/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	8	5	7	3.06	1416/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	5	5	5	7	6	3.14	1402/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	3	3	4	7	9	3.62	968/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	957/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	908/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	5	4	14	4.12	894/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	4	3	10	3.90	557/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 247  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 248  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	13	9	3.70	1370/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	9	12	10	3.85	1270/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	5	13	10	3.97	1010/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1271/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	8	7	10	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	7	5	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	999/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	720/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	2	11	5	3	3.43	1340/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	2	4	17	4.31	1072/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	2	2	7	15	4.22	1366/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	3	4	6	10	3.88	1207/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	2	1	8	4	6	3.52	1310/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	3	1	3	6	10	3.83	845/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	957/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	908/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	5	4	14	4.12	894/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	4	3	10	3.90	557/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 248  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 249  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	13	9	3.70	1370/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	9	12	10	3.85	1270/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	5	13	10	3.97	1010/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1271/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	8	7	10	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	7	5	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	999/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	720/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	7	9	5	3.82	1124/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	846/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	0	5	4	11	4.14	1390/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	944/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	1278/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	4	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	593/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	957/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	908/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	5	4	14	4.12	894/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	4	3	10	3.90	557/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 249  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 250  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	13	9	3.70	1370/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	9	12	10	3.85	1270/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	5	13	10	3.97	1010/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1271/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	8	7	10	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	7	5	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	999/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	720/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	7	9	5	3.82	1124/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	846/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	0	5	4	11	4.14	1390/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	1032/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1205/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	4	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	533/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	957/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	908/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	5	4	14	4.12	894/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	4	3	10	3.90	557/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 250  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 251  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	6	11	21	11	3.60	1413/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	20	20	8	3.50	1392/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	4	14	17	17	3.80	1114/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	9	11	13	5	3.37	1410/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	1	1	8	19	12	3.98	891/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	9	11	5	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	2	1	7	26	15	4.00	1041/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	2	12	37	4.62	987/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	3	6	21	10	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	6	8	18	14	4	3.04	1450/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	3	6	9	32	4.40	1286/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	5	8	14	16	6	3.20	1392/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	8	16	12	8	3.20	1392/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	7	4	6	11	12	7	3.30	1095/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	5	8	14	7	3.53	1055/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	5	8	9	12	3.67	1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	3	9	14	6	3.42	1139/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	3	9	8	12	3.82	598/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.82	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 251  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 58 Non-major 55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 20	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 27	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 252  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	3	6	11	21	11	3.60	1413/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	20	20	8	3.50	1392/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	4	14	17	17	3.80	1114/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	9	11	13	5	3.37	1410/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	1	1	8	19	12	3.98	891/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	9	11	5	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	2	1	7	26	15	4.00	1041/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	2	12	37	4.62	987/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	4	5	14	15	2	3.15	1418/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	1	10	9	15	4.00	1233/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	2	3	11	22	4.39	1291/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	1	10	12	13	3.95	1158/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	1	9	13	10	3.72	1266/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	5	3	2	8	8	11	3.69	933/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	5	8	14	7	3.53	1055/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	5	8	9	12	3.67	1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	3	9	14	6	3.42	1139/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	3	9	8	12	3.82	598/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.82	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 252  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 58 Non-major 55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 20	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 27	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 253  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	3	6	11	21	11	3.60	1413/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	20	20	8	3.50	1392/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	4	14	17	17	3.80	1114/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	9	11	13	5	3.37	1410/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	1	1	8	19	12	3.98	891/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	9	11	5	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	2	1	7	26	15	4.00	1041/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	2	12	37	4.62	987/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	0	4	12	22	4.47	436/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	0	4	9	14	4.37	1018/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	1	4	8	22	4.46	1248/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	642/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	3	3	9	12	4.00	1118/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	8	1	2	4	5	7	3.79	869/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	5	8	14	7	3.53	1055/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	5	8	9	12	3.67	1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	3	9	14	6	3.42	1139/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	3	9	8	12	3.82	598/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.82	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 253  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 58 Non-major 55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 20	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 27	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 254  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	3	6	11	21	11	3.60	1413/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	20	20	8	3.50	1392/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	4	14	17	17	3.80	1114/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	9	11	13	5	3.37	1410/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	1	1	8	19	12	3.98	891/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	9	11	5	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	2	1	7	26	15	4.00	1041/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	2	12	37	4.62	987/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	5	15	16	3	3.38	1357/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	1	7	5	12	4.12	1192/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	7	12	11	4.06	1405/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	1	2	9	8	8	3.71	1269/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	4	3	7	7	5	3.23	1385/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	8	1	4	3	3	6	3.53	1010/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	5	8	14	7	3.53	1055/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	5	8	9	12	3.67	1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	3	9	14	6	3.42	1139/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	3	9	8	12	3.82	598/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.82	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 254  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 58 Non-major 55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 20	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 27	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 255  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	11	21	16	3.71	1361/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	8	17	17	11	3.45	1419/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	13	16	13	3.41	1245/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	3	10	14	3	3.26	1435/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	2	14	10	20	3.92	975/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	4	4	3	8	5	3.25	1313/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	14	17	19	3.84	1196/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	47	4.84	606/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	7	8	18	11	2	2.85	1494/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	11	9	11	16	8	3.02	1451/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	3	5	7	37	4.25	1355/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	13	7	15	8	10	2.91	1444/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	11	8	10	12	12	3.11	1407/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	7	6	7	9	17	3.50	1020/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	20	11	3.63	1014/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	13	18	3.84	1022/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	3	9	13	13	3.55	1104/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	3	4	8	9	15	3.74	637/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.74	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 57 Non-major 54
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 22	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		

I	0	Other	38
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 256  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	11	21	16	3.71	1361/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	8	17	17	11	3.45	1419/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	13	16	13	3.41	1245/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	3	10	14	3	3.26	1435/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	2	14	10	20	3.92	975/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	4	4	3	8	5	3.25	1313/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	14	17	19	3.84	1196/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	47	4.84	606/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	6	2	22	8	2	2.95	1466/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	1	5	9	21	4.21	1142/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	0	5	7	27	4.47	1232/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	2	3	7	9	17	3.95	1158/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	3	0	8	10	16	3.97	1140/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	4	3	5	9	11	3.63	963/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	20	11	3.63	1014/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	13	18	3.84	1022/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	3	9	13	13	3.55	1104/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	3	4	8	9	15	3.74	637/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.74	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 2
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 9	Major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 2	General 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F 0	Under-grad 57
				P 0	Non-major 54
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	38
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 257  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	3	11	21	16	3.71	1361/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	8	17	17	11	3.45	1419/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	13	16	13	3.41	1245/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	3	10	14	3	3.26	1435/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	2	14	10	20	3.92	975/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	4	4	3	8	5	3.25	1313/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	14	17	19	3.84	1196/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	47	4.84	606/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	2	0	1	14	24	4.41	518/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	0	4	26	4.74	526/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	658/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	1	3	25	4.70	422/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	364/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	5	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	385/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	20	11	3.63	1014/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	13	18	3.84	1022/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	3	9	13	13	3.55	1104/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	3	4	8	9	15	3.74	637/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.74	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 57 Non-major 54
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 22	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		



I	0	Other	38
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 258  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	11	21	16	3.71	1361/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	8	17	17	11	3.45	1419/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	13	16	13	3.41	1245/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	3	10	14	3	3.26	1435/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	2	14	10	20	3.92	975/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	4	4	3	8	5	3.25	1313/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	14	17	19	3.84	1196/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	47	4.84	606/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	2	0	1	15	22	4.38	571/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	0	4	26	4.74	526/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	7	28	4.80	810/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	1	4	24	4.67	468/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	364/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	5	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	385/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	20	11	3.63	1014/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	13	18	3.84	1022/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	3	9	13	13	3.55	1104/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	3	4	8	9	15	3.74	637/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.74	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 2
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 9	Major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 2	General 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F 0	Under-grad 57
				P 0	Non-major 54
					Electives 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: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 259  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	18	22	13	3.68	1379/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	8	28	12	8	3.28	1480/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	4	7	11	22	9	3.47	1221/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	19	1	5	12	10	9	3.57	1342/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	13	3	7	8	13	12	3.56	1225/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	11	13	3	3.34	1285/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	2	3	3	17	16	14	3.66	1276/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	9	43	4.74	776/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	5	9	18	9	1	2.81	1501/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	10	9	15	6	10	2.94	1458/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	5	1	9	13	23	3.94	1429/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	12	15	12	4	7	2.58	1467/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	2	8	15	11	9	5	2.75	1455/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	12	8	10	4	9	2.77	1206/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	8	2	13	6	9	3.16	1163/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	3	5	7	7	16	3.74	1062/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	7	1	8	8	14	3.55	1101/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	6	4	6	5	14	3.49	715/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.49	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 259  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	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: 73  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 260  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	18	22	13	3.68	1379/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	8	28	12	8	3.28	1480/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	4	7	11	22	9	3.47	1221/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	19	1	5	12	10	9	3.57	1342/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	13	3	7	8	13	12	3.56	1225/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	11	13	3	3.34	1285/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	2	3	3	17	16	14	3.66	1276/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	9	43	4.74	776/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	6	5	19	10	1	2.88	1489/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	2	4	3	6	16	3.97	1266/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	2	2	3	6	20	4.21	1370/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	4	2	8	4	9	3.44	1349/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	1	5	6	5	4	8	3.14	1402/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	5	4	3	8	6	5	3.19	1121/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	8	2	13	6	9	3.16	1163/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	3	5	7	7	16	3.74	1062/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	7	1	8	8	14	3.55	1101/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	6	4	6	5	14	3.49	715/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.49	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 260  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	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: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 261  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	18	22	13	3.68	1379/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	8	28	12	8	3.28	1480/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	4	7	11	22	9	3.47	1221/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	19	1	5	12	10	9	3.57	1342/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	13	3	7	8	13	12	3.56	1225/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	11	13	3	3.34	1285/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	2	3	3	17	16	14	3.66	1276/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	9	43	4.74	776/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	4	1	0	2	14	21	4.42	504/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	40	0	2	1	1	2	14	4.25	1111/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	2	0	0	5	20	4.52	1201/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	41	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	654/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	40	1	1	2	1	1	14	4.32	910/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	11	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	****/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	8	2	13	6	9	3.16	1163/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	3	5	7	7	16	3.74	1062/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	7	1	8	8	14	3.55	1101/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	6	4	6	5	14	3.49	715/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.49	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 261  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	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: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 262  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	18	22	13	3.68	1379/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	8	28	12	8	3.28	1480/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	4	7	11	22	9	3.47	1221/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	19	1	5	12	10	9	3.57	1342/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	13	3	7	8	13	12	3.56	1225/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	11	13	3	3.34	1285/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	2	3	3	17	16	14	3.66	1276/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	9	43	4.74	776/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	4	1	0	2	15	19	4.38	571/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	40	0	1	2	1	2	14	4.30	1072/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	2	0	1	6	18	4.41	1286/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	41	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	514/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	40	1	1	3	1	1	13	4.16	1027/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	11	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	****/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	8	2	13	6	9	3.16	1163/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	3	5	7	7	16	3.74	1062/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	7	1	8	8	14	3.55	1101/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	6	4	6	5	14	3.49	715/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.49	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 73  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 262  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	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: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 263  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1445/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1005/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1132/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1392/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1407/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1145/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	1	0	2.86	1493/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	2	2	4	3.50	1388/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	1278/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1375/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	2	1	5	3.45	1329/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	0	5	2	3.56	997/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1043/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1163/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	153/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	4.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 263  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 264  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1445/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1005/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1132/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1392/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1407/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1145/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	5	0	0	2.43	1531/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1134/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1366/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1286/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1293/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	856/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1043/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1163/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	153/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	4.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 264  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 265  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1445/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1005/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1132/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1392/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1407/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1145/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	805/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1043/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1163/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	153/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 265  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 266  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1445/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1005/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1132/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1392/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1407/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1145/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	805/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1043/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1163/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	153/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 266  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 267  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	4	5	20	19	13	3.52	1438/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	9	28	13	9	3.26	1484/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	21	21	11	3.44	1233/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.44		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	2	7	15	10	8	3.36	1413/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	8	1	7	12	15	17	3.77	1095/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	3	5	8	9	8	3.42	1251/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	6	17	17	17	3.61	1303/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	3	2	9	46	4.63	957/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	2	12	14	10	4	3.05	1441/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	10	21	13	14	3.45	1397/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	3	5	8	44	4.55	1167/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	10	13	15	9	11	2.97	1430/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	9	9	11	16	12	3.23	1387/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	5	4	6	11	9	16	3.59	983/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	6	6	10	12	10	3.32	1135/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	4	3	11	10	15	3.67	1087/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	8	3	11	10	10	3.26	1178/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	5	5	6	7	16	3.62	685/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.62	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 267  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	65	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 268  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	4	5	20	19	13	3.52	1438/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	9	28	13	9	3.26	1484/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	21	21	11	11	3.44	1233/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	2	7	15	10	8	3.36	1413/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	8	1	7	12	15	17	3.77	1095/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	3	5	8	9	8	3.42	1251/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	6	17	17	17	3.61	1303/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	3	2	9	46	4.63	957/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	7	6	18	8	1	2.75	1506/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	2	4	16	21	4.23	1134/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	3	6	13	23	4.24	1359/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	2	5	12	11	11	3.59	1311/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	5	4	11	12	10	3.43	1338/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	3	0	3	11	9	12	3.86	829/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	6	6	10	12	10	3.32	1135/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	4	3	11	10	15	3.67	1087/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	8	3	11	10	10	3.26	1178/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	5	5	6	7	16	3.62	685/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.62	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 268  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	65	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 269  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	4	5	20	19	13	3.52	1438/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	9	28	13	9	3.26	1484/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	21	21	11	3.44	1233/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.44		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	2	7	15	10	8	3.36	1413/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	8	1	7	12	15	17	3.77	1095/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	3	5	8	9	8	3.42	1251/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	6	17	17	17	3.61	1303/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	3	2	9	46	4.63	957/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	4	1	2	8	17	8	3.81	1132/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	2	12	14	4.31	1064/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	1	3	14	17	4.34	1316/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	0	3	4	9	13	4.10	1069/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	8	10	12	4.03	1102/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	7	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	758/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	6	6	10	12	10	3.32	1135/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	4	3	11	10	15	3.67	1087/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	8	3	11	10	10	3.26	1178/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	5	5	6	7	16	3.62	685/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.62	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 269  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	65	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 270  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	4	5	20	19	13	3.52	1438/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	9	28	13	9	3.26	1484/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	21	21	11	11	3.44	1233/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	2	7	15	10	8	3.36	1413/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	8	1	7	12	15	17	3.77	1095/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	3	5	8	9	8	3.42	1251/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	6	17	17	17	3.61	1303/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	3	2	9	46	4.63	957/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	4	1	1	4	19	11	4.06	897/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	3	12	13	4.24	1118/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	2	2	14	17	4.31	1331/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	0	3	4	8	14	4.14	1047/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	8	9	13	4.17	1020/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	7	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	608/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	6	6	10	12	10	3.32	1135/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	4	3	11	10	15	3.67	1087/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	8	3	11	10	10	3.26	1178/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	5	5	6	7	16	3.62	685/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.62	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 270  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	65	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 271  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	16	16	18	3.84	1299/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	21	14	3.78	1303/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	6	8	23	16	3.92	1048/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	1	2	10	12	7	3.69	1290/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	7	14	19	4.05	829/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	3	1	8	5	6	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	8	18	25	4.23	871/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	9	42	4.75	758/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	2	9	14	12	1	3.03	1444/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	7	17	10	16	3.50	1388/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	4	8	40	4.56	1167/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	10	19	6	13	3.19	1396/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	12	8	10	8	13	3.04	1413/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	9	6	3	6	15	3.31	1095/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	3	12	11	8	3.42	1097/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	0	5	10	20	4.08	910/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	2	13	10	8	3.50	1116/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	1	5	6	6	14	3.84	584/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 271  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 55 Non-major 53
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 42	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 272  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	16	16	18	3.84	1299/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	21	14	3.78	1303/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	6	8	23	16	3.92	1048/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	1	2	10	12	7	3.69	1290/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	7	14	19	4.05	829/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	3	1	8	5	6	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	8	18	25	4.23	871/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	9	42	4.75	758/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	2	6	14	12	2	3.17	1415/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	2	0	7	8	17	4.12	1197/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	3	0	4	10	19	4.17	1384/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	4	2	6	9	13	3.74	1261/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	1	4	2	9	7	9	3.48	1319/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	8	5	1	6	5	6	3.26	1104/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	3	12	11	8	3.42	1097/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	0	5	10	20	4.08	910/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	2	13	10	8	3.50	1116/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	1	5	6	6	14	3.84	584/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 272  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 55 Non-major 53
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 42	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 273  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	16	16	18	3.84	1299/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	21	14	3.78	1303/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	6	8	23	16	3.92	1048/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	1	2	10	12	7	3.69	1290/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	7	14	19	4.05	829/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	3	1	8	5	6	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	8	18	25	4.23	871/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	9	42	4.75	758/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	0	2	5	17	11	4.06	897/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	2	1	1	6	12	4.14	1187/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	2	1	2	7	16	4.21	1370/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	2	0	2	9	10	4.09	1075/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	1	2	2	6	8	3.95	1162/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	10	2	0	3	3	3	3.45	****/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	3	12	11	8	3.42	1097/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	0	5	10	20	4.08	910/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	2	13	10	8	3.50	1116/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	1	5	6	6	14	3.84	584/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 273  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 55 Non-major 53
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 42		
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 274  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	16	16	18	3.84	1299/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	21	14	3.78	1303/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	6	8	23	16	3.92	1048/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	1	2	10	12	7	3.69	1290/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	7	14	19	4.05	829/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	3	1	8	5	6	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	8	18	25	4.23	871/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	9	42	4.75	758/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	2	7	7	11	9	3.50	1303/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	1095/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	1	2	2	9	14	4.18	1382/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	2	1	4	8	8	3.83	1225/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	3	2	4	10	4.11	1065/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	10	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	3	12	11	8	3.42	1097/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	0	5	10	20	4.08	910/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	2	13	10	8	3.50	1116/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	1	5	6	6	14	3.84	584/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 274  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 55 Non-major 53
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 42	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 275  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	10	11	3.87	1266/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	10	6	7	3.33	1463/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	6	8	8	3.55	1196/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1103/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	6	6	9	3.65	1173/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1204/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	3	9	13	4.07	992/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	4	22	4.64	942/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	5	1	8	3	1	2.67	1514/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	7	5	4	8	4	2.89	1462/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	4	3	1	17	4.00	1411/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	5	4	5	8	3	3.00	1421/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	7	1	4	6	7	3.20	1392/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	6	4	6	7	3.40	1066/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	758/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	798/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	786/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	350/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.29	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 276  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	10	11	3.87	1266/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	10	6	7	3.33	1463/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	6	8	8	3.55	1196/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1103/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	6	6	9	3.65	1173/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1204/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	3	9	13	4.07	992/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	4	22	4.64	942/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	0	9	4	2	3.38	1357/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	1206/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	1248/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	2	1	1	7	8	3.95	1158/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	3	3	11	4.05	1091/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	4	1	3	10	3.89	807/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	758/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	798/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	786/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	350/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.29	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 277  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	10	11	3.87	1266/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	10	6	7	3.33	1463/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	6	8	8	3.55	1196/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1103/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	6	6	9	3.65	1173/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1204/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	3	9	13	4.07	992/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	4	22	4.64	942/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	93/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	810/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	231/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	474/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	273/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	758/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	798/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	786/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	350/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.29	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 278  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	10	11	3.87	1266/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	10	6	7	3.33	1463/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	6	8	8	3.55	1196/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1103/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	6	6	9	3.65	1173/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1204/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	3	9	13	4.07	992/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	4	22	4.64	942/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	237/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	736/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1017/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	379/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	637/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	283/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	758/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	798/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	786/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	350/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.29	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 279  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	4.83	3.94	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.83	3.92	4.27	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	5.00	3.86	4.32	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	755/1547	4.50	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.25	4.76	4.64	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1554	5.00	3.80	4.10	4.01	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.83	4.24	4.47	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1053/1493	4.83	4.43	4.73	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.83	4.04	4.32	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	888/1489	4.50	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	4.83	3.72	4.03	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.83	3.80	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 280  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	415/1576	4.83	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	4.83	3.92	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.86	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	3.90	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	339/1547	4.50	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.25	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.80	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	4.83	4.24	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	4.83	4.43	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	4.83	4.04	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	500/1489	4.50	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	4.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	335/1279	4.83	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	3.91	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 281  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	3	4	3.47	1456/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	9	2	3.58	1375/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1209/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	6	6	2	3.50	1362/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	7	5	3.72	1123/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	5	6	2	3.40	1263/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	4	7	3	3.26	1411/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	881/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	13	3	4.06	897/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	870/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	868/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	944/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1162/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	6	4	1	3.31	1095/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	171/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.95	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	189/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.37	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	5	1	4	6	2	2.94	223/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	2.94	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	339/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.84	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MALINOWSKI, MAT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 282  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	3	4	3.47	1456/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	9	2	3.58	1375/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1209/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	6	6	2	3.50	1362/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	7	5	3.72	1123/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	5	6	2	3.40	1263/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	4	7	3	3.26	1411/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	881/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	6	5	4	2	0	2.12	1546/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	1	4	5	2	3.13	1442/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	3	7	1	3	3.13	1488/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	2	3	7	1	3.20	1392/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	2	4	3	2	2.80	1451/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	171/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.95	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	189/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.37	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	5	1	4	6	2	2.94	223/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	2.94	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	339/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.84	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 283  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	1	6	5	3.44	1467/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1275/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1209/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	2	4	6	3.63	1320/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	1180/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	2	6	3.60	1172/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	1	6	5	3.44	1366/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	813/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	3	4	4	2	3.38	1355/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	1095/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	1296/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.01
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1025/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	4	4	6	3.50	1313/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	4	1	2	5	3.00	1149/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	1242/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1177/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1199/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	742/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	162/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	217/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	3.87
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	185/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	334/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.87

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: NGUYEN, DUONG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 284  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	1	6	5	3.44	1467/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1275/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1209/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	2	4	6	3.63	1320/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	1180/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	2	6	3.60	1172/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	1	6	5	3.44	1366/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	813/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	3	3	8	0	3.20	1405/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	2	7	4	3.87	1326/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	3	3	7	3	3.63	1465/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.01
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	7	8	1	3.63	1300/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	4	5	2	3	3.29	1375/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	4	1	1	1	2	2.56	1234/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	1242/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1177/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1199/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	742/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	162/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	217/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	3.87
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	185/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	334/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.87

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 285  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	6	5	5	6	3.50	1445/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	7	4	3.55	1382/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1209/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	4	6	6	1	3.11	1461/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	989/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	7	3	2	3.13	1349/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	10	5	4	3.43	1373/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	832/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	816/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	870/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	868/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	678/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	4	10	4.10	1070/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	3	3	2	5	3.50	1020/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	2	5	1	2	2.53	1246/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	2.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	5	2	2	2	4	2.87	1232/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	6	3	1	2.80	1235/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	2	2	0	2	0	2.33	858/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	2.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	188/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	109/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	190/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	2	1	4	5	8	3.80	185/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	165/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 286  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	6	5	5	6	3.50	1445/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	7	4	3.55	1382/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1209/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	4	6	6	1	3.11	1461/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	989/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	7	3	2	3.13	1349/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	10	5	4	3.43	1373/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	832/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	2	8	6	0	2.80	1501/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	4	1	7	3	2	2.88	1463/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	3	2	3	9	1	3.17	1487/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	1	5	6	1	2.94	1434/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	4	2	5	4	1	2.75	1455/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	4	1	1	2	1	2.44	1244/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	2	5	1	2	2.53	1246/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	2.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	5	2	2	2	4	2.87	1232/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	6	3	1	2.80	1235/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	2	2	0	2	0	2.33	858/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	2.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	188/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	109/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	190/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	2	1	4	5	8	3.80	185/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	165/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 287  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	13	5	3.79	1329/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	13	6	3.96	1187/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1072/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	2	13	4	3.81	1232/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	647/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1105/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	8	5	4	3.21	1422/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	4.46	1140/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	11	5	3.91	1060/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	0	7	14	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	2	20	4.67	1053/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	2	7	11	3.96	1149/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	3	8	6	3.33	1363/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	923/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1161/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1243/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1195/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	153/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	84/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	172/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	161/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.06	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	218/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.06	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 288  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	13	5	3.79	1329/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	13	6	3.96	1187/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1072/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	2	13	4	3.81	1232/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	647/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1105/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	8	5	4	3.21	1422/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	4.46	1140/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	9	6	3.90	1060/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1233/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	1362/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	2	3	2	8	3.88	1207/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1205/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	11	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1161/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1243/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1195/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	153/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	84/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	172/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	161/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.06	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	218/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.06	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 289  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	6	7	3.82	1316/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	1113/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	886/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	3	6	6	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	513/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	758/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	1013/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	1079/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	12	4	3.95	992/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	932/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1029/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	749/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	11	4.14	1042/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	2	7	2	4	3.24	1111/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1014/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	928/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1095/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	99/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.42	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	81/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.58	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	129/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.53	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	1	5	2	9	3.79	186/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	182/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.18	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 289  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 21
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 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 290  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	6	7	3.82	1316/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	1113/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	886/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	3	6	6	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	513/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	758/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	1013/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	1079/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	7	7	1	3.10	1431/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	4	0	2	7	3	3.31	1422/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	3	2	0	8	3	3.38	1480/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	4	1	2	7	2	3.13	1409/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	3	1	3	4	4	3.33	1363/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	10	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1014/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	928/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1095/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	99/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.42	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	81/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.58	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	129/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.53	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	1	5	2	9	3.79	186/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	182/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.18	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 290  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 21
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 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 291  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	5	4	3.47	1456/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	9	4	3.63	1356/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	0	4	3	3.70	1155/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	7	2	3.22	1444/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1138/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1117/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	2	4	5	3.16	1435/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	12	6	4.21	1353/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	8	5	1	3.50	1303/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1171/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1113/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	1158/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	1385/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	4	4	0	5	1	2.64	1222/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	183/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	186/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.12	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	181/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	0	1	6	7	3.82	184/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	329/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
-----					
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	19
			Other	11	Non-major
					18
					0
					1
					1

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 292  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	5	4	3.47	1456/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	9	4	3.63	1356/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	0	4	3	3.70	1155/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	7	2	3.22	1444/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1138/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1117/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	2	4	5	3.16	1435/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	12	6	4.21	1353/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	9	3	1	3.07	1437/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1329/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1445/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1101/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1283/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	2	1	2	0	2	2.86	1198/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	183/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	186/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.12	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	181/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	0	1	6	7	3.82	184/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	329/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 293  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1118/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	785/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	925/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1185/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	778/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1015/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	908/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	702/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	325/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	731/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	909/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	84/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	123/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	209/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	229/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	4	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	14				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: WALI, ALI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 294  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1118/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	785/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	925/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1185/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	778/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1015/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	908/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	0	4	5	3	3.33	1367/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1233/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1468/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1253/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1395/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	84/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	123/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	209/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	229/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	4	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 295  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1073/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	877/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	972/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1199/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	850/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	704/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	737/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	924/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	750/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1053/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	891/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	997/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	974/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	193/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	189/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	137/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	128/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

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 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	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 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: NGUYEN, DUONG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 296  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1073/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	877/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	972/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1199/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	850/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	704/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	737/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	7	2	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1233/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1464/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	5	1	3	3.45	1346/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1192/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	1086/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	193/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	189/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	137/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	128/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

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 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	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 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 297  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	10	5	3.82	1316/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	5	3.86	1259/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1093/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	8	5	6	3.71	1276/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	688/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	6	6	3.75	1093/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	3	7	3	3.20	1422/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	469/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	11	1	3.81	1124/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	1095/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	1089/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	821/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	1005/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1099/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	100/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	211/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	3.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	7	5	4	3.71	193/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	344/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 15		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BEDI AKO, BERNIC (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 298  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	10	5	3.82	1316/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	5	3.86	1259/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1093/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	8	5	6	3.71	1276/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	688/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	6	6	3.75	1093/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	3	7	3	3.20	1422/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	469/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	6	6	2	3.60	1267/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	9	4	3.80	1343/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	6	9	5	3.95	1426/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	10	4	5	3.60	1307/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	6	4	3.55	1305/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	812/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	100/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	211/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	3.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	7	5	4	3.71	193/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	344/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 15		
				? 0			

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 2009

Page 299  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	2	9	7	3.86	1274/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	9	4.00	1138/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	925/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	7	7	3.95	1103/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	688/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	2	10	2	3.44	1239/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	1	11	5	3.81	1219/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	1005/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	666/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	279/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	596/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	3	11	3.86	1214/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	856/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1129/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	129/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	54/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	83/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	68/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.70	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	64/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 22	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 1			

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 300  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	2	9	7	3.86	1274/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	9	4.00	1138/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	925/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	7	7	3.95	1103/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	688/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	2	10	2	3.44	1239/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	1	11	5	3.81	1219/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	649/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	666/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	366/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	1042/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	692/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1129/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	129/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	54/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	83/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	68/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.70	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	64/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 22	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 301  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1194/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	851/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	951/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	6	3	7	3.78	1246/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	708/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	3	5	6	3.71	1123/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	3	2	7	3.19	1424/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	665/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	924/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	666/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	683/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	720/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	1118/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	2	2	1	6	3.36	1080/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	155/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.06	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	135/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	107/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	2	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	149/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.21	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	142/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.29	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	279/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	3.11	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
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 11		
				? 0			



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BEDI AKO, BERNIC (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 302  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1194/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	851/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	951/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	6	3	7	3.78	1246/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	708/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	3	5	6	3.71	1123/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	3	2	7	3.19	1424/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	665/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	6	3	3.75	1166/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	1048/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1150/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	973/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	0	3	6	3.92	1184/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1219/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	155/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.06	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	135/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	107/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	2	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	149/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.21	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	142/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.29	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	279/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	3.11	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 1	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 11
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 303  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	7	7	3.77	1337/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	10	4.18	1005/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	850/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	953/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	3	7	7	3.90	989/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	4	2	6	4	3.63	1162/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	3	6	8	3.71	1255/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	9	2	3.87	1088/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	568/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	19	4.77	868/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	861/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	4	13	4.05	1096/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.99	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	4	0	4	4	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	4	2	3	8	3.72	198/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.72	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	58/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.74	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.37	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	135/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.32	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	175/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.20	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		Under-grad 21
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 304  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	7	7	3.77	1337/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	10	4.18	1005/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	850/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	953/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	3	7	7	3.90	989/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	4	2	6	4	3.63	1162/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	3	6	8	3.71	1255/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	5	7	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	1187/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	1240/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	0	3	8	3.93	1177/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.99	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1200/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	4	2	3	8	3.72	198/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.72	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	58/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.74	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.37	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	135/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.32	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	175/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.20	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		Under-grad 21
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

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 2009

Page 305  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	940/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	581/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	918/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	805/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	468/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	574/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	3	10	6	3.86	1174/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	892/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	957/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	658/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	821/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	13	4.22	983/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	692/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	126/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	165/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	194/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	62/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	118/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	19

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 306  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	940/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	581/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	918/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	805/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	468/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	574/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	3	10	6	3.86	1174/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	504/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	907/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	734/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	437/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	672/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	309/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	126/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	165/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	194/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	62/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	118/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 6	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 18
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 307  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	8	8	4.11	1089/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	515/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	951/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	511/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	366/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	636/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	5	8	3.89	1152/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	702/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	623/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	786/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	334/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	366/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	539/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	623/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	74/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	82/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	133/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	95/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	77/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SLADICK, KELLI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 308  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	8	8	4.11	1089/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	515/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	951/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	511/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	366/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	636/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	5	8	3.89	1152/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	702/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	584/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	385/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	888/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	261/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	474/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	463/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	74/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	82/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	133/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	95/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	77/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0115  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 309  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	4	4	3.56	1424/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	929/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1123/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1225/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1020/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	878/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	4	3	3.31	1401/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1165/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	924/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	957/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	810/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	468/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	888/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	585/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1070/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	928/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	147/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.14	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	141/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	119/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	119/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0115  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 309  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0115  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BEURY, DAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 310  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	4	4	3.56	1424/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	929/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1123/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1225/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1020/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	878/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	4	3	3.31	1401/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1165/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	849/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1192/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1489/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1101/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1118/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	889/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1070/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	928/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	147/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.14	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	141/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	119/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	119/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0115  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BEURY, DAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 310  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0116  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 311  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	682/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	267/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	879/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	511/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	606/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	978/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	1006/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	124/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	722/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	390/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	530/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	552/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	2	0	3	0	5	3.60	974/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	510/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	903/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	928/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	603/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	74/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	107/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	57/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	61/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0116  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BEURY, DAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 312  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	682/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	267/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	879/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	511/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	606/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	978/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	1006/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	822/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1176/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	631/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	754/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1128/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	510/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	903/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	928/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	603/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	74/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	107/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	57/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	61/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.63

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 313  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	16	20	4.40	787/1576	4.40	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	21	9	3.95	1187/1576	3.95	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	11	13	16	4.13	925/1342	4.13	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	5	13	8	4.12	985/1520	4.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	8	11	14	3.97	891/1465	3.97	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	2	6	6	9	3.96	941/1434	3.96	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	8	15	17	4.22	871/1547	4.23	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	31	8	4.21	1361/1574	4.21	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	14	15	1	3.52	1299/1554	3.52	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	9	27	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	11	25	4.53	1193/1493	4.53	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	8	19	13	4.13	1054/1486	4.13	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	14	20	4.32	899/1489	4.32	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	6	5	21	4.39	412/1277	4.39	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	5	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	13	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	31				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 314  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	952/1576	4.42	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	698/1576	4.57	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	583/1342	4.57	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	744/1520	4.40	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2	12	4.25	647/1465	4.36	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	544/1434	4.40	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	6	7	3.85	1182/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	866/1574	4.80	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	298/1554	4.39	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	624/1488	4.78	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	810/1493	4.86	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	561/1486	4.50	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	13	4.20	997/1489	4.38	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	497/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	9	2	3.92	879/1279	3.92	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	1159/1270	3.38	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1148/1269	3.38	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	833/ 878	2.83	3.88	4.05	3.91	2.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	55/ 234	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	30/ 240	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	86/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.68	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	82/ 232	4.73	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	135/ 379	4.38	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.32	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 314  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 315  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	952/1576	4.42	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	698/1576	4.57	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	583/1342	4.57	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	744/1520	4.40	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2	12	4.25	647/1465	4.36	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	544/1434	4.40	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	6	7	3.85	1182/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	866/1574	4.80	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	924/1554	4.39	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	666/1488	4.78	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	810/1493	4.86	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1081/1486	4.50	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	1169/1489	4.38	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	818/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	9	2	3.92	879/1279	3.92	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	1159/1270	3.38	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1148/1269	3.38	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	833/ 878	2.83	3.88	4.05	3.91	2.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	55/ 234	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	30/ 240	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	86/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.68	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	82/ 232	4.73	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	135/ 379	4.38	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.32	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 315  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 316  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	513/1576	4.42	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	364/1576	4.57	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	443/1342	4.57	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	614/1520	4.40	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	410/1465	4.36	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	511/1434	4.40	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	527/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	469/1574	4.80	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	355/1554	4.39	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	124/1488	4.78	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.86	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	311/1486	4.50	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	474/1489	4.38	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	585/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1279	3.92	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1270	3.38	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1269	3.38	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	33/ 234	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.76	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	32/ 240	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	117/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.59	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	46/ 232	4.73	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	96/ 379	4.38	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21



Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 317  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	513/1576	4.42	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	364/1576	4.57	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	443/1342	4.57	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	614/1520	4.40	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	410/1465	4.36	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	511/1434	4.40	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	527/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	469/1574	4.80	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	584/1554	4.39	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	442/1488	4.78	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	334/1493	4.86	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	596/1486	4.50	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	420/1489	4.38	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	856/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1279	3.92	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1270	3.38	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1269	3.38	3.73	4.35	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	33/ 234	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.76	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	32/ 240	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	117/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.59	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	46/ 232	4.73	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	96/ 379	4.38	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21



Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 318  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1089/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	5	4.11	1076/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	865/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1041/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1095/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1178/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	971/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	9	2	3.86	1096/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	263/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	911/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	614/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	645/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	74/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	62/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	44/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	42/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	99/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 319  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1089/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	5	4.11	1076/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	865/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1041/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1095/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1178/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	971/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	924/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	870/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1142/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1010/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1005/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	74/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	62/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	44/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	42/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	99/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.43	

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	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	7	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	18				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 320  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1089/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	5	4.11	1076/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	865/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1041/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1095/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1178/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	971/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1227/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	74/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	62/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	44/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	42/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	99/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 321  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1081/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1212/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	647/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	838/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1081/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	891/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	766/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	125/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	115/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	119/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 322  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1081/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1212/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	647/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	838/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	571/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1321/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1118/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	125/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	115/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	119/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.71

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: MANNING, STEVEN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 323  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1081/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1212/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	647/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	838/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	125/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	115/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	119/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 302 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 324  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	3	2	3	2.75	1558/1576	2.75	3.94	4.30	4.30	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	4	2	3	2.93	1538/1576	2.93	3.92	4.27	4.28	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	3	3	3.06	1289/1342	3.06	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1339/1520	3.57	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	0	2	2	3	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	777/1434	4.17	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	7	2	2	2	2	2.33	1527/1547	2.33	3.87	4.19	4.21	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1165/1574	4.44	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	5	3	5	2	0	2.27	1541/1554	2.27	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.27

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	4	4	3	3.19	1435/1488	3.19	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	4	3	3	2	2.69	1459/1486	2.69	4.04	4.32	4.32	2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	1	4	1	3	2.50	1466/1489	2.50	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	****	3.72	4.03	4.11	****

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	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101  
 Title: PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: GOLDBERG, ROBER (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 74  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 325  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	882/1576	4.31	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	14	9	4.03	1119/1576	4.03	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	11	14	4.31	788/1342	4.31	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	985/1520	4.11	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	8	3	13	3.86	1028/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	748/1434	4.20	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	2	6	15	4.07	992/1547	4.07	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	11	9	4	3.71	1201/1554	3.81	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	1	4	21	4.50	870/1488	4.63	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	1077/1493	4.71	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	9	7	8	3.64	1293/1486	4.02	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	3	2	6	13	3.96	1147/1489	4.25	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	1	1	9	11	4.08	660/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	413/1279	4.56	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	574/1270	4.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	0	15	4.56	614/1269	4.56	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101  
 Title PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 74  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 326  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	882/1576	4.31	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	14	9	4.03	1119/1576	4.03	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	11	14	4.31	788/1342	4.31	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	985/1520	4.11	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	8	3	13	3.86	1028/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	748/1434	4.20	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	2	6	15	4.07	992/1547	4.07	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	13	4	3.91	1060/1554	3.81	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	24	4.75	505/1488	4.63	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	849/1493	4.71	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	5	18	4.39	831/1486	4.02	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	9	16	4.54	660/1489	4.25	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	0	3	5	12	4.00	692/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	413/1279	4.56	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	574/1270	4.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	0	15	4.56	614/1269	4.56	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102  
 Title ADVANCED LAB II  
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 327  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576	4.63	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	719/1520	4.38	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	387/1547	4.63	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.00	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.20	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	4.14	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	596/1486	4.00	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	3.68	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 234	4.71	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	36/ 240	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	77/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	75/ 232	4.67	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102  
 Title ADVANCED LAB II  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFFREY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 328  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576	4.63	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	719/1520	4.38	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	387/1547	4.63	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1303/1554	4.00	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1353/1488	4.20	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1454/1493	4.14	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1253/1486	4.00	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1415/1489	3.68	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	3.00	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 234	4.71	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	36/ 240	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	77/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	75/ 232	4.67	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102  
 Title ADVANCED LAB II  
 Instructor: ZHANG, YU (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 329  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576	4.63	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	719/1520	4.38	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	387/1547	4.63	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1227/1554	4.00	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1233/1488	4.20	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1462/1493	4.14	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1286/1486	4.00	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1363/1489	3.68	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	3.00	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 234	4.71	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	36/ 240	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	77/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	75/ 232	4.67	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA  
 Enrollment: 242  
 Questionnaires: 131

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 330  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	16	32	79	4.48	682/1576	4.48	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	10	21	97	4.66	406/1576	4.66	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	3	9	29	86	4.56	531/1342	4.56	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	57	0	4	11	18	34	4.22	891/1520	4.22	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	13	1	6	9	25	71	4.42	498/1465	4.42	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	78	1	3	11	10	23	4.06	852/1434	4.06	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	13	32	79	4.49	543/1547	4.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	19	107	4.85	586/1574	4.85	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	2	0	0	5	41	57	4.50	395/1554	4.50	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	19	105	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	8	116	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	23	100	4.76	325/1486	4.76	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	6	19	100	4.72	420/1489	4.72	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	25	4	3	18	27	42	4.06	668/1277	4.06	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	103	0	2	0	8	5	13	3.96	****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	102	0	2	0	11	2	14	3.90	****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	99	0	3	2	4	5	18	4.03	****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	100	24	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	121	2	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	122	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	123	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	122	1	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	119	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	125	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	126	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	127	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	126	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	127	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	127	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	128	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	128	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	129	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	127	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	126	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	128	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	127	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	127	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	128	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA  
 Enrollment: 242  
 Questionnaires: 131

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 330  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 26	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 2 Major 5
28-55	26	1.00-1.99 0	B 38		
56-83	22	2.00-2.99 13	C 30	General 1	Under-grad 129 Non-major 126
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 26	D 2		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 7	Other 96	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 331  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	757/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	825/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	857/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1212/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	748/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1087/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	992/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1128/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	623/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	589/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1077/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	499/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	696/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	533/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	712/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	928/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	74/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	154/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	49/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	105/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATTHEW (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 332  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	757/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	825/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	857/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1212/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	748/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1087/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	992/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1128/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	712/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	1025/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1142/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	584/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	500/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	309/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	712/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	928/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	74/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	154/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	49/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	105/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 333  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	443/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	646/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	476/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	366/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	544/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	592/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1018/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	1247/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	339/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	888/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	660/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	515/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	64/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	177/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.14	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	119/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	64/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: WAUCHOPE, ORRET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 334  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	443/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	646/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	476/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	366/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	544/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	592/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1018/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	0	0	4	3	3.67	1227/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	666/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1053/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	468/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	637/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	829/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	64/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	177/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.14	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	119/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	64/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 335  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1299/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	851/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1132/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1059/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1093/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1189/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	860/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.99	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	708/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1176/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	1010/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	1	5	3.82	1231/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	812/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	381/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1018/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	151/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	210/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	107/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	44/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 335  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 336  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1299/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	851/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1132/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1059/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1093/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1189/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1081/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.99	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1181/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1344/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1101/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	0	5	3.86	1214/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	381/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1018/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	151/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	210/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	107/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	44/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 336  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 337  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1274/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1049/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1128/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	748/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1063/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	737/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1128/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	662/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	750/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1053/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	792/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	742/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	823/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1000/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	736/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	122/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	54/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	158/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	64/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.60	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	****	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: HOUPPT, JOSHUA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 338  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1274/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1049/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1128/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	748/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1063/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	737/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1128/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1060/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	1111/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	0	6	4	4.00	1411/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	749/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1236/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	692/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1000/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	736/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	122/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	54/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	158/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	64/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.60	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	****	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 339  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	697/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	735/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	902/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	424/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	670/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	148/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	911/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	662/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	638/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	908/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	530/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	500/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	515/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	144/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	171/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	48/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	45/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	32/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.86	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	3	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATTHEW (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 340  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	697/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	735/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	902/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	424/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	670/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	148/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	911/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	144/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	171/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	48/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	45/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	32/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.86	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	3	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	11				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 341  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1148/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1227/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	972/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1166/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	989/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	826/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	608/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	692/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	708/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	966/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	922/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	921/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	533/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1267/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1261/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1259/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	122/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	122/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	133/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	139/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.30	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	265/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.17	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	207/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.29	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	261/ 382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.29	

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	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	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 351L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: WAUCHOPE, ORRET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 342  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1148/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1227/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	972/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1166/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	989/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	826/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	608/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	860/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1233/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1390/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	959/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1118/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1267/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1261/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1259/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	122/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	122/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	133/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	139/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.30	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	265/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.17	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	207/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.29	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	261/ 382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.29	

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	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	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 351L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 343  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	1	3.75	1345/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	851/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	972/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1281/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1214/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1063/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1239/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	712/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.99	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	932/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	1306/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1010/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1192/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	463/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	802/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1142/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	188/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	141/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	119/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	119/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	145/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
-----					
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	1	12
			Other	10	Non-major
					11
					0
					Major
					1
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 344  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	1	3.75	1345/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	851/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	972/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1281/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1214/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1063/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1239/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1187/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.99	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1411/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1286/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1313/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	802/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1142/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	188/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	141/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	119/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	119/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	145/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
-----					
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	1	12
			Other	10	Non-major
					11
					0
					Major
					1
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 345  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1316/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1237/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1132/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1246/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1123/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1191/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1211/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	532/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1053/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	763/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	888/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	818/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1033/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	157/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	198/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	154/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	181/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	148/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.27	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: HOUPPT, JOSHUA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 346  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1316/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1237/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1132/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1246/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1123/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1191/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1211/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1201/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1411/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1473/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1367/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1352/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	943/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1033/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	157/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	198/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	154/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	181/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	148/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.27	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 10
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 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH  
 Enrollment: 125  
 Questionnaires: 105

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 347  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	0	13	88	4.84	211/1576	4.54	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	16	85	4.82	208/1576	4.46	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	14	86	4.79	263/1342	4.49	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	0	4	11	72	4.78	218/1520	4.47	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	0	7	18	71	4.56	335/1465	4.29	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	1	1	1	9	65	4.77	184/1434	4.46	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	12	87	4.81	186/1547	4.33	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	94	4.91	422/1574	4.73	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	13	90	4.86	138/1554	3.71	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	101	4.98	50/1488	4.54	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	103	4.99	56/1493	4.81	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.99	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	16	85	4.80	284/1486	4.41	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	11	89	4.83	274/1489	4.53	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	62	1	1	4	11	19	4.28	515/1277	3.65	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	97	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	97	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	96	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	97	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	104	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	104	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.32	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	104	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	1	0	0	43	4	4.02	224/ 379	4.02	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.02	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	0	0	0	33	4	1	3.16	268/ 375	3.16	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.16	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	0	0	0	32	3	1	3.14	239/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.14	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	66	0	0	0	33	3	3	3.23	273/ 382	3.23	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.23	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	30	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	32	2.00-2.99	21	C	40	General	0	Under-grad	104	Non-major	104
84-150	28	3.00-3.49	19	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	21	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	82				
				?	6						

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN  
 Enrollment: 221  
 Questionnaires: 112

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 348  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	6	14	28	61	4.23	976/1576	4.54	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	5	24	22	57	4.10	1082/1576	4.46	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	2	19	24	60	4.20	879/1342	4.49	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	6	3	14	20	54	4.16	945/1520	4.47	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	15	8	4	10	27	45	4.03	834/1465	4.29	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	22	4	4	8	29	41	4.15	787/1434	4.46	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	8	10	18	27	46	3.85	1182/1547	4.33	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	1	2	41	63	4.55	1041/1574	4.73	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	43	6	19	40	2	2.56	1521/1554	3.71	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	6	5	11	34	50	4.10	1203/1488	4.54	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	4	1	3	15	84	4.63	1101/1493	4.81	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	5	5	20	28	48	4.03	1094/1486	4.41	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	2	5	4	12	23	58	4.23	976/1489	4.53	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	55	13	3	11	6	12	3.02	1147/1277	3.65	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	94	0	8	1	0	4	5	2.83	****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	95	0	4	1	4	4	4	3.18	****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	95	0	4	3	0	3	7	3.35	****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	96	13	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	110	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	111	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	111	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	4.02	4.24	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	37	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	8
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	42						
56-83	28	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	3	Under-grad	110	Non-major	104
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	35	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	87				
				?	2						



Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 349  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	818/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	798/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	735/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	429/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1041/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	682/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	722/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1101/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	678/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	463/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	154/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	165/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	193/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.14	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	209/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	180/ 326	3.54	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	193/ 382	3.48	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.80	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	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	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 350  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	818/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	798/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	735/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	429/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1041/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	924/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1155/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	955/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	154/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	165/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	193/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.14	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	209/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	180/ 326	3.54	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	193/ 382	3.48	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.80	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	8	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	7			
				? 2					

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 351  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	1	9	4.15	1050/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	0	2	7	4.09	1082/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	972/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	731/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	1043/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	826/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	985/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1227/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	1233/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	1384/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	1101/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	3	7	4.08	1075/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1107/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	559/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	122/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	133/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	105/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 352  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	1	9	4.15	1050/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	0	2	7	4.09	1082/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	972/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	731/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	1043/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	826/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	985/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	194/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	970/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	1270/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	596/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	789/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	559/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	122/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	133/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	105/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 353  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	1	7	3.87	1274/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1410/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1166/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1431/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	2	5	2	3.07	1374/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1204/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1380/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.83	547/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	7	1	3	3.23	1396/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	1212/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1404/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	4	3	4	3.36	1371/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1270/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1246/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	140/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	128/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	197/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	6	0	1	2.64	228/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	2.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	369/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.18	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	177/ 326	3.54	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.57	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.48	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.17	

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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 354  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	1	7	3.87	1274/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1410/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1166/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1431/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	2	5	2	3.07	1374/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1204/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1380/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.83	547/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	6	3	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	1425/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1443/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1383/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	1463/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	140/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	128/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	197/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	6	0	1	2.64	228/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	2.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	369/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.18	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	177/ 326	3.54	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.57	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.48	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.17	

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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 355  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1148/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1345/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1097/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1212/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1439/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1204/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1041/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1166/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1329/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1344/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1222/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1222/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	974/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1064/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	928/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1116/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	129/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	148/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	195/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	229/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: LIU, YUANYUAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 356  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1148/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1345/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1097/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1212/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1439/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1204/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1041/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1166/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1233/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1450/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1101/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1415/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1064/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	928/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1116/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	129/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	148/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	195/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	229/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 357  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1509/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1438/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1249/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1281/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1004/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1305/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1303/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1331/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1368/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1255/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1245/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1363/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	974/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	204/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	148/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	220/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	220/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	357/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.63

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 358  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1509/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1438/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1249/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1281/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1004/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1305/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1303/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	204/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	3.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	148/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	220/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	220/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.13	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	357/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 359  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	3	0	3	2	0	2.50	1566/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	1	0	5	0	2.78	1552/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1294/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	1493/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	2.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1343/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1399/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1513/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	2.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1493/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	0	3	2	3.25	1428/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1465/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1367/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	2.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1381/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1207/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	228/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	2.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	233/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	224/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	3.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	5	0	2	1	0	1.88	231/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	1.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	377/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	2.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 360  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	3	0	3	2	0	2.50	1566/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	1	0	5	0	2.78	1552/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1294/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	1493/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	2.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1343/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1399/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1513/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	2.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	4	0	0	2.43	1531/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1482/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1492/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1480/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	2.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1466/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	228/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	2.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	233/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	224/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	3.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	5	0	2	1	0	1.88	231/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	1.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	377/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	2.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 361  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1000/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1040/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1119/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	929/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	668/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1162/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	0	3	7	4.08	992/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	8	0	3.42	1345/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1033/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	1270/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1078/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	867/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	997/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	35/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	54/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	107/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	215/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	193/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.14	

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	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, BRIAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 362  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1000/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1040/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1119/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	929/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	668/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1162/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	0	3	7	4.08	992/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	1345/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1406/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1467/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1307/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1415/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	35/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	54/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	107/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	215/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	193/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.14	

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	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 363  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	988/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1253/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1132/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	511/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	738/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	748/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1167/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	1079/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1194/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1233/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1344/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1039/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1035/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	943/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	91/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	93/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	195/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	55/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	

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	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	5	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: LIU, YUANYUAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 364  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	988/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1253/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1132/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	511/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	738/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	748/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1167/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	1079/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1194/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1433/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1411/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1330/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1415/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	91/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	93/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	195/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	55/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 365  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1266/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1058/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	972/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	768/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	322/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	878/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1294/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1381/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1388/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1210/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1400/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1283/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	889/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	91/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	133/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	206/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	355/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 366  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1266/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1058/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	972/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	768/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	322/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	878/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1294/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	827/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	91/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	133/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	206/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	355/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 367  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	1562/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	1523/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	1329/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	0	1	3	2.78	1496/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1302/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1412/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	2.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	2	2	0	2.22	1533/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	2.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	911/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	1524/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	1398/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	1321/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1421/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	0	3	3	3.33	1363/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1257/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	157/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	217/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	172/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	165/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 368  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	1562/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	1523/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	1329/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	0	1	3	2.78	1496/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	2.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1302/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1412/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	2.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	2	2	0	2.22	1533/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	2.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	911/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	1390/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1470/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1490/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1286/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1478/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	157/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	217/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	172/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	165/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 369  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1299/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1433/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	1269/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	1281/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	2	3	3	3.08	1372/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1172/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	3	3	4	3.58	1311/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	3	4	2	3.42	1345/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1353/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1447/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1386/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1290/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1128/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	154/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	172/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	132/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	165/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.22

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 370  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1299/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1433/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	1269/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	1281/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	2	3	3	3.08	1372/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1172/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	3	3	4	3.58	1311/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	924/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1380/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1411/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1101/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1363/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	154/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	172/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	132/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	165/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.22	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 371  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1370/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1307/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1157/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1153/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1035/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	758/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	1333/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	586/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	5	4	1	3.25	1390/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1212/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1337/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1365/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	4	4	3.38	1350/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1186/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1238/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1210/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	153/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	186/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	203/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	225/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	2.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	329/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	

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	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, BRIAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 372  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1370/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1307/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1157/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1153/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1035/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	758/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	1333/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	586/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	692/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1018/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1210/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	959/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	845/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1186/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1238/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1210/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	153/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	186/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	203/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	225/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	2.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	329/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	

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	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 373  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1257/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1303/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	1283/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1300/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1012/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	777/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1418/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	1381/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1324/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1395/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1245/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	976/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1208/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1255/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	2.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	216/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	369/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 374  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1257/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1303/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	1283/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1300/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1012/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	777/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1418/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1233/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1053/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1101/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	997/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1208/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1255/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	2.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	216/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	369/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 375  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	861/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1248/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1166/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1320/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1028/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	797/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1443/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1340/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1192/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1210/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	959/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1205/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1207/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	157/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	185/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 376  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	861/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1248/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1166/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1320/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1028/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	797/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1443/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	157/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	185/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major 7
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	6

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

Course-Section: CHEM 401 0101  
 Title CHEM/STAT THERMODYNAMICS  
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 377  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	893/1576	4.30	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1237/1576	3.90	3.92	4.27	4.35	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1068/1342	3.90	3.86	4.32	4.46	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1185/1520	3.88	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	2	0	2.30	1457/1465	2.30	3.90	4.12	4.22	2.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1021/1434	3.88	3.75	4.14	4.30	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	971/1547	4.10	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	860/1554	4.11	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1072/1488	4.30	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1307/1486	3.60	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1065/1489	4.10	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1099/1277	3.29	3.72	4.03	4.04	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	827/1270	4.25	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	819/1269	4.25	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 433 0101  
 Title BIOCHEM OF NUCLEIC ACI  
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 378  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1482/1576	3.40	3.94	4.30	4.46	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1438/1576	3.40	3.92	4.27	4.35	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1249/1342	3.40	3.86	4.32	4.46	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1431/1465	2.75	3.90	4.12	4.22	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1434	****	3.75	4.14	4.30	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1534/1547	2.20	3.87	4.19	4.24	2.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1390/1554	3.25	3.80	4.10	4.24	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1421/1486	3.00	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1236/1489	3.80	3.97	4.32	4.38	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1238/1277	2.50	3.72	4.03	4.04	2.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 379  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	861/1576	4.40	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	851/1576	4.30	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	899/1342	4.21	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	1041/1520	4.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	850/1465	3.89	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	878/1434	4.17	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	673/1547	4.40	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.97	4.76	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	924/1554	4.14	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	822/1488	4.68	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1306/1493	4.51	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	944/1486	4.51	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	539/1489	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.53	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	50/ 234	4.65	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	69/ 240	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	133/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	57/ 232	4.77	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	55/ 379	4.30	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 380  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	861/1576	4.40	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	851/1576	4.30	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	899/1342	4.21	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	1041/1520	4.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	850/1465	3.89	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	878/1434	4.17	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	673/1547	4.40	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.97	4.76	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	623/1554	4.14	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	4.68	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1053/1493	4.51	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	891/1486	4.51	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	955/1489	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	4.53	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	50/ 234	4.65	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	69/ 240	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	133/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	57/ 232	4.77	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	55/ 379	4.30	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 381  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	697/1576	4.40	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	929/1576	4.30	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	835/1342	4.21	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	683/1520	4.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1088/1465	3.89	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	594/1434	4.17	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	718/1547	4.40	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.97	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	892/1554	4.14	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	750/1488	4.68	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	1321/1493	4.51	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	596/1486	4.51	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	579/1489	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	385/1277	4.53	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.31	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1187/1270	3.20	3.91	4.35	4.53	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	3.20	3.73	4.35	4.55	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	54/ 234	4.65	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	23/ 240	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	59/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	52/ 232	4.77	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	305/ 379	4.30	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 382  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	697/1576	4.40	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	929/1576	4.30	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	835/1342	4.21	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	683/1520	4.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1088/1465	3.89	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	594/1434	4.17	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	718/1547	4.40	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.97	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	827/1554	4.14	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	786/1488	4.68	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1053/1493	4.51	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.51	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1050/1489	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	309/1277	4.53	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.31	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1187/1270	3.20	3.91	4.35	4.53	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	3.20	3.73	4.35	4.55	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	54/ 234	4.65	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	23/ 240	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	59/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	52/ 232	4.77	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	305/ 379	4.30	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: FORD, DIANA L.  
 Enrollment: 86  
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 383  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	9	13	43	4.52	609/1576	4.52	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	11	46	4.55	542/1576	4.55	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	18	44	4.66	418/1342	4.66	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	2	3	12	24	4.41	665/1520	4.41	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	2	7	14	34	4.40	513/1465	4.40	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	1	8	15	25	4.24	704/1434	4.24	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	7	12	41	4.41	673/1547	4.41	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	1	0	0	34	25	4.37	1236/1574	4.37	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	1	9	24	16	4.10	871/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	17	42	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	7	22	33	4.34	1316/1493	4.34	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	9	21	31	4.29	936/1486	4.29	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	1	10	14	35	4.33	899/1489	4.33	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	4	9	15	26	4.11	653/1277	4.11	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	64	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.53	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	64	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.55	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.70	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.90	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	3.97	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 37	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 2
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	32	3.00-3.49	D 0		64
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	54
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 455 0101  
 Title INTRO BIOMEDICINAL CHE  
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 384  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	5	5	51	4.69	373/1576	4.69	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	10	48	4.69	350/1576	4.69	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	9	47	4.65	430/1342	4.65	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	0	4	7	36	4.68	320/1520	4.68	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	10	10	35	4.13	768/1465	4.13	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	26	0	0	3	3	29	4.74	201/1434	4.74	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	5	3	53	4.79	207/1547	4.79	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	58	4.95	235/1574	4.95	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	55	4.87	129/1554	4.87	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	59	4.95	124/1488	4.95	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	61	4.98	112/1493	4.98	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	10	52	4.84	241/1486	4.84	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	56	4.87	228/1489	4.87	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	21	1	0	3	5	17	4.42	385/1277	4.42	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	2	1	0	2	4	3.56	****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	55	0	2	1	1	0	5	3.56	****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	56	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 11	C 11	General	18
84-150	33	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	18

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 385  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	861/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	770/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1043/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	878/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	571/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	891/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	350/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	560/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	107/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	155/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 386  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	861/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	770/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1043/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	878/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	682/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	107/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	155/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 387  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	861/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	770/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1043/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	878/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1194/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1253/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	107/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	155/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 388  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	861/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	770/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1043/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	878/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	107/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	155/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 389  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	568/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	849/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	851/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	228/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	181/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	209/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	40/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	332/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.88

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 390  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	568/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1096/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1048/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1053/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	696/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	209/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	40/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	332/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 391  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	568/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	924/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1171/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1321/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1233/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	209/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	40/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	332/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 392  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	568/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	924/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1171/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1321/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1233/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	209/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	40/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	332/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490 0101  
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN CHEM  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 393  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1576	4.67	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.67	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	658/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	719/1520	4.38	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1465	4.38	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	755/1547	4.33	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	355/1554	4.56	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.43	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	888/1489	4.33	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	943/1277	3.67	3.72	4.03	4.04	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 601 0101  
 Title CURRENT TOPICS IN CHEM  
 Instructor: SUMMERS, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 394  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	3.94	4.30	4.43	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	728/1576	4.43	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	345/1342	4.71	3.86	4.32	4.38	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	291/1520	4.71	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1434	4.67	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	445/1547	4.57	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.75	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554	4.86	3.80	4.10	4.18	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.88	4.24	4.47	4.52	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.43	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.97	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.72	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	603/1279	4.33	3.80	4.17	4.34	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.60	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.11	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 605L 0101  
 Title ADV INORG CHEM LAB  
 Instructor: DANIEL, MC (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 395  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.92	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	3.86	4.32	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	5.00	3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	4.67	3.80	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.24	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.43	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.04	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.97	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.72	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.36	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.37	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.49	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.14	4.29	4.47	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.37	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.70	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 605L 0101  
 Title ADV INORG CHEM LAB  
 Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 396  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.92	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	3.86	4.32	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	5.00	3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	623/1554	4.67	3.80	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.36	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.37	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.49	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.14	4.29	4.47	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.37	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.70	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 633 0101  
 Title BIOCHEM OF NUCLEIC ACI  
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 397  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1383/1576	3.67	3.94	4.30	4.43	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1345/1576	3.67	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1256/1342	3.33	3.86	4.32	4.38	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1300/1520	3.67	3.84	4.25	4.36	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	3.90	4.12	4.25	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1142/1434	3.67	3.75	4.14	4.35	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1506/1547	2.67	3.87	4.19	4.24	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1367/1554	3.33	3.80	4.10	4.18	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1368/1488	3.67	4.24	4.47	4.52	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1375/1486	3.33	4.04	4.32	4.37	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1363/1489	3.33	3.97	4.32	4.38	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1219/1277	2.67	3.72	4.03	4.08	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 684 0101  
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN CHEMIST  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 398  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	3.94	4.30	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	3.86	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	3.90	4.12	4.25	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	594/1434	4.33	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.80	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.24	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.43	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.97	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	463/1277	4.33	3.72	4.03	4.08	4.33	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 684A 0101  
 Title: TECHNIQ NMR SPECTROSCO  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 399  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	500/1576	4.60	3.94	4.30	4.43	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.86	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.60	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.80	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	5.00	3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.17	3.80	4.10	4.18	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	4.10	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.70	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1277	4.30	3.72	4.03	4.08	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	206/ 234	3.60	4.22	4.23	4.36	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	215/ 240	3.80	4.38	4.35	4.37	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	185/ 229	4.25	4.49	4.51	4.51	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	200/ 232	3.60	4.14	4.29	4.47	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.37	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	4.13	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 684A 0101  
 Title: TECHNIQ NMR SPECTROSCO  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 399  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 684A 0101  
 Title TECHNIQ NMR SPECTROSCOP  
 Instructor: YEH, DEOKCHEON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 400  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	500/1576	4.60	3.94	4.30	4.43	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.86	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.60	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.80	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	5.00	3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1227/1554	4.17	3.80	4.10	4.18	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.90	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1392/1486	4.10	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	813/1489	4.70	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	692/1277	4.30	3.72	4.03	4.08	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	206/ 234	3.60	4.22	4.23	4.36	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	215/ 240	3.80	4.38	4.35	4.37	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	185/ 229	4.25	4.49	4.51	4.51	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	200/ 232	3.60	4.14	4.29	4.47	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.37	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	4.13	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 684A 0101  
 Title            TECHNIQ NMR SPECTROSCO  
 Instructor:     YEH, DEOKCHEON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment:     6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 400  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 690 0101  
 Title CHEMISTRY SEMINAR  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 401  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1266/1576	3.88	3.94	4.30	4.43	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	939/1576	4.25	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.86	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	768/1520	4.33	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.90	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	3.75	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1547	5.00	3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1166/1554	3.75	3.80	4.10	4.18	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.24	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.04	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.97	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.72	4.03	4.08	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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