

Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101
 Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 191
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	9	4.17	991/1504	4.17	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	692/1503	4.38	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	8	12	4.17	853/1290	4.17	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	1136/1453	3.85	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	532/1421	4.27	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	5	9	3	3.38	1208/1365	3.38	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	290/1485	4.67	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	12	4	3.91	989/1483	3.91	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	348/1425	4.79	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	755/1426	4.79	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	695/1418	4.42	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	623/1416	4.50	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	4	16	4.48	300/1199	4.48	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	4	3	7	3.56	993/1312	3.56	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	3	4	4	7	3.83	1020/1303	3.83	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	5	3	7	3.88	1004/1299	3.88	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	524/ 758	3.69	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.69
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101
 Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 191
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 192
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	9	9	14	3.94	1153/1504	3.71	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	16	12	4.11	981/1503	3.78	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	12	14	3.97	962/1290	3.63	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	963/1453	3.52	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	5	4	9	13	3.97	792/1421	3.93	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1201/1365	3.46	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	5	13	12	3.91	1076/1485	3.98	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	691/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	9	15	4	3.82	1072/1483	3.59	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	7	22	4.47	818/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	9	23	4.62	1036/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	8	14	10	3.94	1064/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	10	10	13	4.00	1029/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	5	8	18	4.24	503/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	6	7	12	3.83	864/1312	3.70	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	3	6	8	9	3.68	1072/1303	3.39	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	5	8	8	3.46	1119/1299	3.50	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	5	1	5	2	3	2.81	718/ 758	2.97	3.71	4.01	3.80	2.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 192
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	34
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 193
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	12	20	10	3.80	1244/1504	3.71	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	12	19	10	3.80	1187/1503	3.78	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	8	10	14	12	3.62	1123/1290	3.63	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	4	6	11	3	3.54	1270/1453	3.52	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	623/1421	3.93	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	1	4	6	4	6	3.48	1167/1365	3.46	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	9	16	17	4.02	979/1485	3.98	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	2	39	4.95	329/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	4	14	10	5	3.48	1241/1483	3.59	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	5	15	22	4.33	981/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	13	26	4.55	1096/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	14	12	11	3.67	1201/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	6	3	4	8	12	10	3.59	1219/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	636/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	7	14	14	3.71	922/1312	3.70	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	6	9	12	10	3.38	1143/1303	3.39	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	3	9	8	14	3.46	1119/1299	3.50	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	3	28	2	2	4	4	2	3.14	667/ 758	2.97	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 193
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	45	Non-major	44
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	12	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	38				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 194
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	2	9	30	15	3.74	1271/1504	3.71	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	12	24	19	3.85	1159/1503	3.78	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	9	14	22	14	3.56	1140/1290	3.63	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	30	3	1	7	12	8	3.68	1225/1453	3.52	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	6	9	20	22	3.97	792/1421	3.93	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	42	2	1	2	9	4	3.67	1065/1365	3.46	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	4	10	13	31	4.02	984/1485	3.98	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	2	56	4.92	591/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	4	5	10	22	10	3.57	1211/1483	3.59	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	6	17	36	4.37	930/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	12	44	4.61	1036/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	3	15	15	25	3.87	1110/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	5	9	4	8	18	18	3.56	1228/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	3	4	10	12	28	4.02	632/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	15	14	24	4.00	716/1312	3.70	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	6	5	14	15	16	3.54	1113/1303	3.39	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	5	21	13	15	3.61	1092/1299	3.50	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	7	38	3	3	5	2	5	3.17	664/ 758	2.97	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	7	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Requirement	Count	Level	Count	Requirement	Count
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	3	B	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	C	23	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
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	53				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 195
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	34	0	2	5	19	15	6	3.38	1395/1504	3.71	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	34	0	1	3	21	15	7	3.51	1300/1503	3.78	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	34	0	3	6	14	19	5	3.36	1185/1290	3.63	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	34	24	3	1	7	9	3	3.35	1346/1453	3.52	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	35	2	2	5	11	15	11	3.64	1036/1421	3.93	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	36	29	1	2	6	6	1	3.25	****/1365	3.46	3.75	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	36	0	2	4	10	16	13	3.76	1176/1485	3.98	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	35	2	0	1	0	2	41	4.89	691/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	2	2	4	16	10	7	3.41	1271/1483	3.59	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	2	11	15	18	4.07	1143/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	34	0	0	2	5	12	28	4.40	1197/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	5	7	14	13	7	3.22	1312/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	3	5	4	12	10	12	3.47	1256/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	2	4	5	10	12	13	3.57	898/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	4	5	9	11	14	3.60	976/1312	3.70	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	6	4	15	10	8	3.23	1171/1303	3.39	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	3	4	14	11	8	3.42	1133/1299	3.50	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	38	33	3	2	2	3	0	2.50	****/ 758	2.97	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	76	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	79	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	79	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	79	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	79	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	B 17		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 20	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	81
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	2
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0
I 0
? 2

Other

41

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 196
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	10	12	10	3.69	1293/1504	3.71	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	7	17	6	3.60	1272/1503	3.78	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	16	8	3.64	1120/1290	3.63	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	5	2	3	7	2	2.95	1416/1453	3.52	3.76	4.21	4.11	2.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	9	11	10	3.94	827/1421	3.93	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	1241/1365	3.46	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	6	9	17	4.21	818/1485	3.98	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	6	2	0	0	1	27	4.70	960/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	3	0	6	14	5	3.64	1179/1483	3.59	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	4	15	14	4.06	1147/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	5	1	7	22	4.22	1280/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	7	16	7	3.71	1186/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	2	6	12	8	3.65	1205/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	7	14	11	3.94	703/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	2	8	7	5	3.36	1062/1312	3.70	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	3	9	4	5	3.12	1188/1303	3.39	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	3	5	6	8	3.52	1103/1299	3.50	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	9	18	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	721/ 758	2.97	3.71	4.01	3.80	2.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 196
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN
 Enrollment: 332
 Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 197
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	14	22	36	4.18	972/1504	4.22	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	17	28	29	4.09	996/1503	4.05	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	11	20	42	4.36	681/1290	4.06	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	64	0	5	2	1	4	3.33	****/1453	3.50	3.76	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	5	4	12	16	30	3.93	839/1421	4.09	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	62	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	****/1365	5.00	3.75	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	17	25	29	4.03	979/1485	4.14	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	3	71	4.92	525/1504	4.96	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	18	39	13	3.90	989/1483	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	14	57	4.71	510/1425	4.48	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	12	60	4.78	773/1426	4.89	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	10	27	34	4.21	887/1418	4.23	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	12	27	32	4.15	961/1416	3.95	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	4	11	23	35	4.22	527/1199	4.11	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	63	0	3	2	5	2	1	2.69	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	63	0	3	1	5	3	1	2.85	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	63	0	1	0	8	2	2	3.31	****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	63	9	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	75	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN
 Enrollment: 332
 Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 197
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	30	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	76	Non-major	75
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	68				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN
 Enrollment: 93
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 198
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.22	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.05	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1078/1290	4.06	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	548/1421	4.09	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.75	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	761/1485	4.14	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1036/1425	4.48	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	4.89	4.11	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.23	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1167/1416	3.95	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	636/1199	4.11	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 199
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	7	6	1	3.05	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	5	4	3.26	1379/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	6	5	3	3.11	1233/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1148/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	827/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	558/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	8	3	4	3.26	1346/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	4	3	2	5	0	2.57	1441/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	5	2	5	5	3.44	1320/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	4	5	3	4	3.05	1404/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	1	2	6	4	3.05	1327/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	2	5	1	4	2.72	1356/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1108/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	1240/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	0	2	1	2	2.67	1235/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	1	2	2	0	2.22	1265/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	2	2	9	4	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	119/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	113/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	103/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	90/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 199
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: MASUCCI, MICHAEL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 200
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	7	6	1	3.05	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	5	4	3.26	1379/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	6	5	3	3.11	1233/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1148/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	827/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	558/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	8	3	4	3.26	1346/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	741/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	5	0	9	4.13	1111/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1232/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	754/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	953/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	860/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	1240/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	0	2	1	2	2.67	1235/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	1	2	2	0	2.22	1265/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	2	2	9	4	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	119/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	113/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	103/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	90/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: MASUCCI, MICHAEL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 200
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 201
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	5	4	4	2.95	1461/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	8	4	4	3.14	1400/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	2	4	4	2.76	1260/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	3	5	4	3.10	1394/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	1	4	6	3	3.05	1297/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	6	3	5	3.20	1262/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	6	1	5	2	2.48	1455/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76	879/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	6	2	7	2	1	2.44	1450/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	3	5	9	3.76	1255/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	5	1	4	5	6	3.29	1398/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	3	7	3	3	2.81	1361/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	5	3	3	2.57	1371/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1138/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	0	2	4	2	2.71	1217/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	2	2	2	1	2.14	1269/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	5	2	0	1	1.93	1276/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.93
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	5	1	3	2	6	3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	192/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	190/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	4	3	2	5	3.12	210/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	4	3	5	3	2	2.76	200/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	2.76
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 201
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SARAH, EVANS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 202
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	3	5	4	4	2.95	1461/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	8	4	4	3.14	1400/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	2	4	4	2.76	1260/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	3	5	4	3.10	1394/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	1	4	6	3	3.05	1297/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	6	3	5	3.20	1262/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	6	1	5	2	2.48	1455/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76	879/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	1	4	6	4	3.26	1324/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	3	6	1	5	3.24	1350/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	2	4	5	5	3.25	1400/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	6	4	4	3.16	1319/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	4	1	4	2.88	1345/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	0	2	4	2	2.71	1217/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	2	2	2	1	2.14	1269/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	5	2	0	1	1.93	1276/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.93
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	5	1	3	2	6	3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	192/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	190/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	4	3	2	5	3.12	210/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	4	3	5	3	2	2.76	200/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	2.76
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SARAH, EVANS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 202
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 203
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	10	2	3	2.95	1461/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	4	2	2	2.48	1486/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	8	4	5	2	1	2.20	1284/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	9	6	0	3.05	1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	5	8	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	8	4	4	3.42	1191/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	6	4	3	2.86	1415/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	20	4.86	743/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	10	6	1	0	2.25	1458/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	6	6	5	1	2.85	1392/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	6	4	7	2	1	2.40	1420/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	8	5	1	5	1	2.30	1401/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	5	6	1	2	2.40	1388/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	3	0	0	1	2.17	1175/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1296/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1257/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1289/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.50
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	2	6	6	6	3.67	183/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	4	5	8	3	3.38	208/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	5	3	9	3	3.50	204/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	189/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	4	2	7	6	3.52	165/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.52
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 203
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SARAH, EVANS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 204
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	10	2	3	2.95	1461/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	4	2	2	2.48	1486/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	8	4	5	2	1	2.20	1284/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	9	6	0	3.05	1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	5	8	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	8	4	4	3.42	1191/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	6	4	3	2.86	1415/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	20	4.86	743/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	2	10	2	3.75	1123/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	1337/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1388/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1159/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1319/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1296/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1257/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1289/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.50
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	2	6	6	6	3.67	183/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	4	5	8	3	3.38	208/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	5	3	9	3	3.50	204/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	189/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	4	2	7	6	3.52	165/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.52
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SARAH, EVANS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 204
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 205
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	4	1	2.86	1473/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	1	2.71	1467/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	4	1	0	1	2.11	1287/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1083/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1222/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	6	2	3.31	1236/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	2	2	3.00	1387/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	6	3	0	2.83	1411/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	1324/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	1	5	2	3	3.07	1403/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	5	5	1	3.07	1325/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	4	1	2	2.54	1375/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	1310/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	201/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	170/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	197/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	1	1	6	4	3.64	187/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	106/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 14
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 13

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILANG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 206
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	4	1	2.86	1473/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	1	2.71	1467/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	4	1	0	1	2.11	1287/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1083/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1222/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	6	2	3.31	1236/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	2	2	3.00	1387/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	2	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1340/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1364/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	1364/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1324/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	1310/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	201/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	170/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	197/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	1	1	6	4	3.64	187/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	106/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 207
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1384/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	0	4	1	4	2.93	1434/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	2	3	3	3.15	1226/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1209/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1036/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	903/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1298/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	5	0	4	2	0	2.27	1457/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	1	5	1	3	2.86	1392/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	1	3	3	3	3.00	1406/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	4	2	2	2.71	1371/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	3	0	2	2.21	1398/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1153/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1233/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1272/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	167/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	141/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	174/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	4	0	2	2	4	3.17	205/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	97/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.15
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
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
? 1

Other

12

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 208
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4	4	3.43	1384/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	0	4	1	4	2.93	1434/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	2	3	3	3.15	1226/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1209/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1036/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	903/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1298/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1233/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1272/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	167/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	141/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	174/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	4	0	2	2	4	3.17	205/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	97/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.15
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, BROTE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 209
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	1	7	2	4	3.06	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	4	4	2	2.72	1465/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	3	3	2	2.67	1271/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	7	2	3.06	1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	3	3	2.94	1327/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	4	2	2.89	1318/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	5	2	3	2	2.44	1459/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	6	4	4	0	0	1.86	1477/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	4	1	4	4	2.89	1388/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	7	5	2	0	2.28	1423/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	3	4	4	0	2.28	1402/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	3	3	2	0	1.88	1406/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	2	0	0	1	1.75	1300/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	6	2	0	0	0	1.25	1295/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	2	2	0	0	1.75	1279/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.75
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	4	3	1	4	5	3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	4	2	6	3	3.38	209/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	6	1	4	3	3.00	219/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	2	2	3	5	3.19	203/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.19
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	160/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: RS, PAUL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 210
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	7	2	4	3.06	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	4	4	2	2.72	1465/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	3	3	2	2.67	1271/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	7	2	3.06	1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	3	3	2.94	1327/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	4	2	2.89	1318/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	5	2	3	2	2.44	1459/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1415/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	2	0	0	1	1.75	1300/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	6	2	0	0	0	1.25	1295/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	2	2	0	0	1.75	1279/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.75
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	4	3	1	4	5	3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	4	2	6	3	3.38	209/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	6	1	4	3	3.00	219/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	2	2	3	5	3.19	203/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.19
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	160/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
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 18		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: KEATHING, LORYN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 211
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	7	2	4	3.06	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	4	4	2	2.72	1465/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	3	3	2	2.67	1271/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	7	2	3.06	1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	3	3	2.94	1327/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	4	2	2.89	1318/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	5	2	3	2	2.44	1459/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1204/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	3	1	0	2	3	3.11	1363/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1395/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	4	0	3	2	0	2.33	1400/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	0	4	0	2.67	1362/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	2	0	0	1	1.75	1300/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	6	2	0	0	0	1.25	1295/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	2	2	0	0	1.75	1279/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.75
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	4	3	1	4	5	3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	4	2	6	3	3.38	209/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	6	1	4	3	3.00	219/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	2	2	3	5	3.19	203/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.19
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	160/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 212
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	8	7	3.82	1239/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	7	4	5	3	2.91	1438/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	9	2	2	2	2.35	1281/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	8	2	7	3.60	1253/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	6	3	3	6	3.14	1276/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	4	5	6	3.58	1118/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	9	5	2	3.05	1383/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	8	4	4	3	1	2.25	1458/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	5	7	2	3.10	1364/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	3	12	1	1	2.62	1418/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	7	5	4	1	2.65	1380/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	8	3	5	2	2	2.35	1391/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	1	6	0	2	3.33	987/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	2	4	1	0	1.93	1293/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	6	1	0	1	1.80	1289/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	9	0	0	0	1.60	1285/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	207/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	193/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	140/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	178/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	2	2	8	3.81	142/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.81
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

20 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 5.00 ****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 212
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: CHAUDHAIR, PRAJ (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 213
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	8	7	3.82	1239/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	7	4	5	3	2.91	1438/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	9	2	2	2	2.35	1281/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	8	2	7	3.60	1253/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	6	3	3	6	3.14	1276/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	4	5	6	3.58	1118/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	9	5	2	3.05	1383/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	433/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	1008/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	6	7	4	3.78	1364/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	5	5	6	3.88	1106/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	1135/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	748/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	2	4	1	0	1.93	1293/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	6	1	0	1	1.80	1289/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	9	0	0	0	1.60	1285/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	207/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	193/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	140/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	178/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	2	2	8	3.81	142/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.81
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

20 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 5.00 ****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: CHAUDHAIR, PRAJ (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 213
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 214
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1343/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	0	2.54	1482/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	4	2	1	0	1.92	1290/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	1.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1385/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	4	0	3.08	1293/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1133/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	6	0	1	2.62	1445/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	4	6	0	1	2.67	1434/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	3	1	1	2.50	1409/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	3	4	3	0	2.54	1419/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	4	1	1	2.62	1386/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	3	2	0	2.23	1397/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	3	1	0	2.33	1272/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	3	4	0	0	2.22	1263/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	1271/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.11
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	167/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	171/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	174/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	182/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	170/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.46

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 215
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1343/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	0	2.54	1482/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	4	2	1	0	1.92	1290/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	1.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1385/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	4	0	3.08	1293/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1133/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	6	0	1	2.62	1445/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	5	0	3.40	1276/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1299/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1280/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1250/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	3	3	0	2.78	1352/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	3	1	0	2.33	1272/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	3	4	0	0	2.22	1263/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	1271/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.11
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	167/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	171/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	174/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	182/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	170/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.46

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 216
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	6	6	2	3.28	1414/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	5	3	1	2.61	1477/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	3	4	1	2.50	1276/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	8	4	1	3.00	1404/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	4	6	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	7	1	4	3.13	1280/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	11	2	2	1	2.39	1466/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	7	5	3	1	0	1.88	1476/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	4	5	4	2	2.89	1388/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	6	9	1	2	0	1.94	1426/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	8	2	2	0	2.00	1410/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	4	3	1	2.28	1395/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	1175/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	2	2	2	0	2.20	1280/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	5	3	1	1	0	1.80	1289/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	7	1	1	1	0	1.60	1285/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	755/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	1.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	209/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	2	4	6	1	3.13	222/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	194/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	6	4	3	3.40	196/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	182/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILANG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 217
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	6	6	2	3.28	1414/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	5	3	1	2.61	1477/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	3	4	1	2.50	1276/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	8	4	1	3.00	1404/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	4	6	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	7	1	4	3.13	1280/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	11	2	2	1	2.39	1466/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	731/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1076/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1369/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1141/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1199/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	884/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	2	2	2	0	2.20	1280/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	5	3	1	1	0	1.80	1289/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	7	1	1	1	0	1.60	1285/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	755/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	1.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	209/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	2	4	6	1	3.13	222/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	194/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	6	4	3	3.40	196/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	182/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		18

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 218
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1384/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	3	2	2.86	1445/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	5	4	2	2.75	1261/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1001/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	1	5	6	3.44	1150/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	8	4	3.67	1065/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	3	6	5	3.38	1317/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	8	4	6	0	0	1.89	1476/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	6	8	2	3	2.90	1386/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	7	6	6	1	1	2.19	1425/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	5	4	3	1	2.30	1401/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	3	2	2	2	2.05	1400/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	5	2	2	0	1	2.00	1181/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	3	3	2	1	2.36	1269/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	1	2	0	2	2.00	1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	0	2	0	1	1.62	1284/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	3	7	5	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	6	9	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	5	2	7	4	3.56	201/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	0	4	10	3.94	162/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	2	9	3	3.50	166/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 218
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: PAN, ON MEI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 219
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1384/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	3	2	2.86	1445/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	5	4	2	2.75	1261/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1001/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	1	5	6	3.44	1150/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	8	4	3.67	1065/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	3	6	5	3.38	1317/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	3	1	3	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1414/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1379/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	3	3	2	1	2.36	1269/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	1	2	0	2	2.00	1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	0	2	0	1	1.62	1284/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	3	7	5	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	6	9	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	5	2	7	4	3.56	201/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	0	4	10	3.94	162/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	2	9	3	3.50	166/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: PAN, ON MEI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 219
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 220
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1384/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	3	2	2.86	1445/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	5	4	2	2.75	1261/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1001/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	1	5	6	3.44	1150/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	8	4	3.67	1065/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	3	6	5	3.38	1317/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	580/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	940/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1312/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	772/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1099/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	780/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	3	3	2	1	2.36	1269/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	1	2	0	2	2.00	1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	0	2	0	1	1.62	1284/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	3	7	5	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	6	9	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	5	2	7	4	3.56	201/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	0	4	10	3.94	162/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	2	9	3	3.50	166/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 220
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 221
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	9	6	3.61	1322/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	9	4	3	2.96	1428/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	3	8	2	4	2.78	1257/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	7	8	4	3.59	1255/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	9	3	6	3.48	1131/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	5	9	3.82	960/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	5	4	7	3.39	1314/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	726/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	6	3	6	3	0	2.33	1454/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	5	4	6	3.32	1336/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	5	4	3	7	3	2.95	1410/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	2	6	3	5	2.95	1342/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	5	3	3	4	2.64	1365/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	9	2	1	1	2	2.00	1288/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	6	2	1	0	1.87	1286/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	8	2	2	0	0	1.50	1289/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	2	3	5	11	3.91	160/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	3	3	5	10	3.78	180/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	2	4	4	6	7	3.52	203/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.52
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	1	3	2	7	9	3.91	169/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	5	7	9	3.96	119/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.96
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 221
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 222
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	9	6	3.61	1322/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	9	4	3	2.96	1428/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	3	8	2	4	2.78	1257/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	7	8	4	3.59	1255/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	9	3	6	3.48	1131/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	5	9	3.82	960/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	5	4	7	3.39	1314/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	726/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	9	2	1	1	2	2.00	1288/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	6	2	1	0	1.87	1286/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	8	2	2	0	0	1.50	1289/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	2	3	5	11	3.91	160/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	3	3	5	10	3.78	180/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	2	4	4	6	7	3.52	203/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.52
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	1	3	2	7	9	3.91	169/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	5	7	9	3.96	119/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.96
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

20 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 5.00 ****

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 222
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 223
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	1409/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1410/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	3.00	1236/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1370/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	0	3	1	2.78	1364/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	4	4	3.46	1172/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	3	3	3.23	1352/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	3	4	1	0	2.56	1443/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	4	2	3	3.08	1364/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	5	3	2	1	2	2.38	1420/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	1	2	2.92	1349/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	1	2	3	2.69	1359/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	1265/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	1	2	0	1	2.13	1271/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	3	0	1	2.50	1248/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	139/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	145/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	147/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	153/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	106/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13

84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	10
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 224
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	1409/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1410/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	3.00	1236/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1370/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	0	3	1	2.78	1364/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	4	4	3.46	1172/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	3	3	3.23	1352/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	338/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	900/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	878/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	984/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1029/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	1265/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	1	2	0	1	2.13	1271/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	3	0	1	2.50	1248/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	139/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	145/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	147/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	153/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	106/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13

84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	10
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 225
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	851/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1281/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	853/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1136/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	903/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1032/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1440/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1340/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1398/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1290/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1093/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1121/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1106/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	186/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	187/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	164/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	190/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	186/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.29

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: CHANDRASEKHARAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 226
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	851/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1281/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	853/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1136/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	903/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1032/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1440/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1197/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1165/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1128/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1093/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1121/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1106/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	186/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	187/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	164/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	190/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	186/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.29

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 227
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1322/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1453/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1175/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1377/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	548/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1419/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1314/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1327/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1367/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1424/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1367/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1199/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1272/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	71/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: CHANDRASEKHARAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 228
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1322/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1453/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1175/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1377/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	548/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1419/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1314/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1415/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1373/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1379/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1324/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1272/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	71/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM
 Instructor: DA SILVA, VERA
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 229
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	4	13	11	8	3.07	1445/1504	3.07	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	11	15	9	4	2.83	1450/1503	2.83	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	13	12	9	7	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	34	3	3	2	1	3	2.83	1432/1453	2.83	3.76	4.21	4.11	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	3	10	7	17	3.73	976/1421	3.73	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	38	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	****/1365	****	3.75	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	6	14	9	12	3.42	1306/1485	3.42	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	42	4.93	460/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	9	5	16	7	1	2.63	1436/1483	2.63	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	7	4	7	14	10	3.38	1329/1425	3.38	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	5	13	21	4.21	1284/1426	4.21	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	16	8	13	2	3	2.24	1404/1418	2.24	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	8	12	4	5	2.52	1376/1416	2.52	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	24	6	5	5	1	1	2.22	1171/1199	2.22	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	46
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	16	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	40				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 230
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	522/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	290/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	488/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	578/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	392/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	333/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	750/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	854/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	173/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	270/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	414/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	821/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	908/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1084/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1232/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1133/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	44/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	38/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	57/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	172/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	94/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.19

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: LAIRD, KHOLISWA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 231
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	522/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	290/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	488/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	578/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	392/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	333/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	750/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	854/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	2	6	1	3.15	1355/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1076/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	3	0	1	4	4	3.50	1381/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	905/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1112/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1084/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1232/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1133/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	44/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	38/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	57/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	172/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	94/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.19

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 232
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4	4	8	4.00	1092/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	751/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	809/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	855/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	9	4.00	745/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	681/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	866/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	274/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	300/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	331/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	837/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	542/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	572/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	652/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	94/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	71/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	29/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	96/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	124/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 232
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 233
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4	4	8	4.00	1092/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	751/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	809/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	855/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	9	4.00	745/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	681/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	866/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1141/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	1117/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	2	0	6	4.00	1319/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	1013/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	961/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	572/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	652/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	94/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	71/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	29/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	96/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	124/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 233
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: POLLACK, RALPHT (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 234
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	10	6	4.22	927/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	587/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	661/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	798/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	479/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	441/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	670/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1059/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1017/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	84/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	45/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	164/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	215/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	2.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	5	1	3	4	3.29	186/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Requirement	Count	Level	Count	Requirement	Count
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: YMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 235
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	927/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	587/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	661/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	798/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	479/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	441/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	670/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	282/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	420/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	572/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	354/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	324/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	593/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1059/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1017/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	84/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	45/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	164/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	215/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	2.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	5	1	3	4	3.29	186/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Requirement	Count	Level	Count	Requirement	Count
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: LAIRD, KHOLISWA (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 236
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	927/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	587/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	661/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	798/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	479/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	441/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	670/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	5	4	6	1	0	2.19	1462/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	2	3	2	0	0	2.00	1415/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1420/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	3	0	4	0	0	2.14	1408/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	1407/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1059/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1017/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	84/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	45/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	164/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	215/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	2.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	5	1	3	4	3.29	186/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 302 0101
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 237
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	17	4.34	775/1504	4.34	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	6	9	9	3.79	1192/1503	3.79	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	11	10	3.93	996/1290	3.93	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	6	6	11	3.88	879/1421	3.88	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	754/1365	4.06	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	6	16	4.29	727/1485	4.29	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	460/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	5	12	4	3.56	1211/1483	3.56	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	7	17	4.34	961/1425	4.34	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	7	21	4.66	981/1426	4.66	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	7	9	7	3.55	1237/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	5	14	3.97	1057/1416	3.97	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	5	6	12	4.17	561/1199	4.17	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	902/1312	3.75	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	701/1303	4.38	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	705/1299	4.38	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 302 0101
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 237
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	21
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101
 Title PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 238
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	7	15	4.30	838/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	16	4.37	692/1503	4.37	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	642/1290	4.41	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	752/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	6	6	10	3.96	804/1421	3.96	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	187/1365	4.67	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	6	16	4.38	613/1485	4.38	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	3	9	6	3.90	989/1483	3.90	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	510/1425	4.71	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	1065/1426	4.58	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	4	7	11	4.04	1000/1418	4.04	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	0	4	17	4.33	806/1416	4.33	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	736/1199	3.92	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****

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	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	28
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 239
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	1.00	1501/1504	1.00	3.80	4.27	4.27	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1503	1.00	3.60	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.00	3.75	4.08	4.08	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	3.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	2.50	3.94	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	3.75	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1416/1418	2.00	3.68	4.25	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1412/1416	1.25	3.56	4.26	4.27	1.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1181/1199	2.00	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	1.00	3.14	4.24	4.27	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.00	3.13	4.25	4.30	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	226/ 233	2.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	235/ 244	2.00	4.05	4.09	4.20	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	218/ 225	2.00	3.95	4.23	4.29	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: KE, HAOHAO (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 240
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	1.00	1501/1504	1.00	3.80	4.27	4.27	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1503	1.00	3.60	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.00	3.75	4.08	4.08	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1422/1425	2.50	3.94	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1406/1426	3.75	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1416/1418	2.00	3.68	4.25	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1412/1416	1.25	3.56	4.26	4.27	1.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	1.00	3.14	4.24	4.27	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.00	3.13	4.25	4.30	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	226/ 233	2.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	235/ 244	2.00	4.05	4.09	4.20	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	218/ 225	2.00	3.95	4.23	4.29	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 241
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	1.00	1501/1504	1.00	3.80	4.27	4.27	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1503	1.00	3.60	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.00	3.75	4.08	4.08	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	3.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1367/1425	2.50	3.94	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1319/1426	3.75	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1330/1418	2.00	3.68	4.25	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1401/1416	1.25	3.56	4.26	4.27	1.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1181/1199	2.00	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	1.00	3.14	4.24	4.27	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.00	3.13	4.25	4.30	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	226/ 233	2.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	235/ 244	2.00	4.05	4.09	4.20	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	218/ 225	2.00	3.95	4.23	4.29	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: SAUER, SCOTT (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 242
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	1.00	1501/1504	1.00	3.80	4.27	4.27	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1503	1.00	3.60	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.00	3.75	4.08	4.08	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1422/1425	2.50	3.94	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1406/1426	3.75	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1330/1418	2.00	3.68	4.25	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1412/1416	1.25	3.56	4.26	4.27	1.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	1.00	3.14	4.24	4.27	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.00	3.13	4.25	4.30	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	226/ 233	2.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	235/ 244	2.00	4.05	4.09	4.20	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	218/ 225	2.00	3.95	4.23	4.29	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES
 Enrollment: 172
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 243
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	3	9	19	26	3.98	1112/1504	3.98	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	9	9	17	24	3.85	1159/1503	3.85	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	7	9	13	27	3.92	1013/1290	3.92	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	38	3	4	3	6	6	3.36	1341/1453	3.36	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	4	2	11	15	23	3.93	839/1421	3.93	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	42	1	3	2	3	8	3.82	954/1365	3.82	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	4	4	15	14	20	3.74	1188/1485	3.74	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	4	0	0	1	2	51	4.93	525/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	2	2	7	19	11	3.85	1041/1483	3.85	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	0	4	17	31	4.39	920/1425	4.39	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	1	11	40	4.63	1022/1426	4.63	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	3	2	15	13	20	3.85	1123/1418	3.85	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	2	1	3	9	10	29	4.21	904/1416	4.21	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	24	2	4	4	7	12	3.79	800/1199	3.79	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	3	2	4	3	3.21	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	49	0	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	1	3	3	3	4	3.43	****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	49	8	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

62 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 3.95 ****

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES
 Enrollment: 172
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 243
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	51				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 244
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1353/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1340/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	1155/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1136/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	2	0	2.33	1402/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1003/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	2	4	2	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	940/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	6	5	0	3.07	1372/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1267/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1319/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	1209/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	2	3.29	1290/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1098/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	910/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	158/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	158/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	118/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	3	0	2	6	3.54	193/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	139/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.85

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: NOKOLA, GOKAL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 245
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1353/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1340/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	1155/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1136/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	2	0	2.33	1402/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1003/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	2	4	2	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	940/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1157/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	0	3	2	3.25	1346/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1381/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1217/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1324/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1125/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	910/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	158/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	158/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	118/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	3	0	2	6	3.54	193/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	139/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.85

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 246
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	0	9	3	3.93	1173/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	9	4	4.14	954/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1147/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	890/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1073/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	782/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	890/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1197/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	700/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1073/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1081/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1029/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	636/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	530/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1153/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1078/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	96/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	58/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	92/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	49/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	75/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SHUKLA, BRAHMI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 247
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	0	9	3	3.93	1173/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	9	4	4.14	954/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1147/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	890/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1073/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	782/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	890/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	850/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	426/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	845/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	530/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1153/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1078/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	96/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	58/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	92/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	49/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	75/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 248
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	4.33	788/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1127/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	902/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	878/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	3	0	5	3.60	1056/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1084/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	761/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1197/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	1076/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1248/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1013/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1158/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1106/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	663/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1059/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	922/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	557/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	143/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	162/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	147/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	169/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	106/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 248
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: YILDIZ, FATMA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 249
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	4.33	788/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1127/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	902/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	878/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	3	0	5	3.60	1056/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1084/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	761/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	171/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	1122/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	663/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1059/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	922/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	557/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	143/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	162/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	147/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	169/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	106/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: YILDIZ, FATMA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 249
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 250
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	4	4	5	3.50	1353/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	3	3.63	1263/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1140/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	968/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	3	4	3	3.21	1252/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	960/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	4	2	3.19	1362/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1157/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1267/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1183/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	1	7	2	3.36	1291/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	1238/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1013/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	2	7	4	3.73	178/233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	143/244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	118/227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	135/225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	7	2	5	3.73	151/207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 250
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 251
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	4	4	5	3.50	1353/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	3	3.63	1263/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1140/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	968/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	3	4	3	3.21	1252/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	960/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	4	2	3.19	1362/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1076/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1319/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	799/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1199/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	2	7	4	3.73	178/233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	143/244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	118/227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	135/225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	7	2	5	3.73	151/207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 251
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 252
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	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	5	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1331/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1109/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1123/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1286/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	782/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1265/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1009/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	971/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1089/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1201/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1158/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	771/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	137/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	136/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	82/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	136/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	182/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.33

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: YILDIZ, FATMA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 253
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1331/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1109/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1123/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1286/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	782/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1265/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1215/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1319/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1128/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1248/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	987/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	137/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	136/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	82/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	136/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	182/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.33

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 254
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	5	3	3.55	1340/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1178/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	0	3	4	3.27	1207/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	1	4	2	3.00	1404/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	3	2	2.82	1357/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1285/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1123/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	1342/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1128/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1289/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	2	3	3.18	1306/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	1	1	3	0	2.50	1138/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1237/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1185/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	0	1	2	0	2.14	1270/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.14
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	4	2	3.50	190/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	183/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	142/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	201/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	195/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	50/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

9 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 3.95 ****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 254
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SKUKLA, BRAHMI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 255
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	5	3	3.55	1340/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1178/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	0	3	4	3.27	1207/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	1	4	2	3.00	1404/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	3	2	2.82	1357/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1285/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1123/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1234/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1376/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1013/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1184/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1115/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1237/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1185/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	0	1	2	0	2.14	1270/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.14
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	4	2	3.50	190/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	183/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	142/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	201/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	195/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	50/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

9 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 3.95 ****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SKUKLA, BRAHMI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 255
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 256
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1010/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1052/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1236/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	741/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1353/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	890/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1340/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1183/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1181/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1264/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	987/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1239/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	71/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	83/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	106/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 257
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1010/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1052/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1236/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	741/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1353/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	890/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	900/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1290/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	905/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1268/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	820/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1239/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	71/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	83/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	106/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE LN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 258
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	6	0	3.44	1331/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1143/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1168/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	1	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1169/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1154/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	896/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	587/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	877/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	675/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	922/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	137/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	165/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	179/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	110/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	135/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.89

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: UKOLA, GOKUL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 259
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	6	0	3.44	1331/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1143/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1168/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	1	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	772/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.81

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1238/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1300/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1232/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1029/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	780/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.98

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	877/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	675/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	922/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.67

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	137/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	165/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	179/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	110/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	135/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.89

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK
 Enrollment: 172
 Questionnaires: 122

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 260
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	3	18	36	60	4.22	927/1504	4.36	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	6	22	40	50	4.11	990/1503	4.29	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	5	15	48	48	4.12	887/1290	4.29	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	67	1	1	9	24	17	4.06	974/1453	4.22	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	14	1	6	9	19	69	4.43	383/1421	4.50	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	65	2	5	8	17	20	3.92	878/1365	4.29	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	3	3	13	20	30	49	3.95	1047/1485	4.22	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	4	112	4.97	263/1504	4.98	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	3	2	3	10	48	41	4.18	710/1483	4.32	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	7	35	73	4.53	760/1425	4.72	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	12	103	4.84	667/1426	4.91	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	4	30	38	43	4.02	1009/1418	4.33	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	5	27	25	56	4.06	1011/1416	4.28	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	29	5	4	18	29	30	3.87	762/1199	4.12	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	100	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	101	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	102	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	101	1	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	****/758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	118	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/233	****	3.96	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	118	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/244	****	4.05	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	118	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/227	****	4.16	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	118	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/225	****	3.95	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	118	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/207	****	3.84	4.09	4.14	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	121	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	121	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	121	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	121	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	37						
56-83	41	2.00-2.99	16	C	34	General	0	Under-grad	122	Non-major	114
84-150	33	3.00-3.49	30	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	31	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I 0
? 4

Other

111

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH
 Enrollment: 182
 Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 261
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	6	23	55	4.50	549/1504	4.36	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	6	30	49	4.47	556/1503	4.29	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	8	24	52	4.45	574/1290	4.29	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	42	2	1	2	12	27	4.39	618/1453	4.22	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	0	8	15	57	4.57	276/1421	4.50	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	60	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	187/1365	4.29	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	0	10	19	55	4.49	468/1485	4.22	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	85	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	2	0	5	19	42	4.46	397/1483	4.32	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	5	77	4.92	161/1425	4.72	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	82	4.99	101/1426	4.91	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	20	59	4.64	414/1418	4.33	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	8	16	56	4.49	636/1416	4.28	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	25	2	1	8	7	35	4.36	412/1199	4.12	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	69	0	4	1	4	2	9	3.55	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	1	0	5	3	12	4.19	****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	68	15	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	85	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	85	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	85	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	86	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH
 Enrollment: 182
 Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 261
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	7	C	18	General	0	Under-grad	89	Non-major	88
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	22	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	62				
				?	4						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 262
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	927/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	459/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1001/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1113/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	493/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	338/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	947/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1029/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	542/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	46/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 262
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: BAKKI, BRAIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 263
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	5	4.22	927/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	459/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1001/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1113/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	493/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	543/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1257/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1250/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	806/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	46/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: BAKKI, BRAIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 263
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0103
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 264
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1061/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	954/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	937/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	821/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	579/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	472/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1257/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	854/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	402/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	630/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	407/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	213/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1106/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	129/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	67/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	146/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	103/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.08
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0
I 0
? 0

Other

13

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0103
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: RIVERA, LIZ (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 265
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1061/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	954/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	937/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	821/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	579/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	472/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1257/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	854/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1093/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1022/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	1197/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	981/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1180/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1018/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1106/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	129/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	67/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	146/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	103/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.08
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0

- Means there are not enough

P 0
I 0
? 0

Other

13

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 266
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	609/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	678/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1075/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	680/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	633/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	581/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1253/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	810/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	842/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	643/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	901/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	851/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	71/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	67/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	158/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	113/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	88/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SANKARA, NARESH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 267
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	609/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	678/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1075/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	680/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	633/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	581/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1253/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	657/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1073/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	682/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	845/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	***/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	851/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	71/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	67/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	158/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	113/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	88/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 268
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	750/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	827/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	681/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	440/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1222/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	708/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	990/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	618/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1050/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	913/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	688/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	810/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1240/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1053/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	102/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	97/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	138/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	97/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	79/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SANKARA, NARESH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 269
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	3	6	4.36	750/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	827/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	681/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	440/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1222/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	708/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	990/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	580/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	700/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	895/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	818/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	961/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	919/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1240/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1053/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	102/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	97/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	138/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	97/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	79/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 270
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	1	6	4.30	826/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	795/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	935/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	283/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	525/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1284/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	409/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	665/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	656/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	574/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	471/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	776/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	63/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	34/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	58/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	33/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.78
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
----------------	----------	-----------------	---------	------	--------

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: RIVERA, LIZ (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 271
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	1	6	4.30	826/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	795/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	935/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	283/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	525/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1284/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	493/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	790/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	317/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	727/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	860/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	776/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	63/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	34/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	58/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	33/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.78
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
----------------	----------	-----------------	---------	------	--------

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 272
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	594/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	633/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	671/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	501/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	712/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	346/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	1104/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	1041/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	793/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	4	11	4.35	951/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	549/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	7	9	4.35	754/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	837/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	636/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1184/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	66/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	64/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	67/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	64/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 272
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: MOTEL, BILLY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 273
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	594/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	633/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	671/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	501/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	712/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	346/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	1104/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	1041/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	710/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	1217/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	828/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1145/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	987/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1184/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	66/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	64/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	67/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	64/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: MOTEL, BILLY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 273
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 274
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	1092/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1052/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	758/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1200/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	745/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	782/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1261/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	635/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	971/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	860/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	838/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	6	7	4.13	969/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	603/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1240/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1227/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	165/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.87
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	158/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	141/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	93/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 275
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	1092/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1052/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	758/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1200/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	745/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	782/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1261/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	4	0	3.18	1346/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1257/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	1381/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	0	4	3	1	2.91	1354/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	3	0	2	1	2.30	1394/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1240/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1227/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	165/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.87
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	158/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	141/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	93/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 276
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	4	4.07	1061/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	722/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	937/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	957/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	997/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	603/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	878/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	784/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1065/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	848/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	806/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	840/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1139/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	113/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	95/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	115/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	86/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	56/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 276
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: ZHUI, VIC (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 277
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	4	4.07	1061/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	722/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	937/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	957/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	997/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	603/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	878/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1223/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1050/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1013/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	994/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1139/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	113/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	95/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	115/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	86/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	56/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: ZHUI, VIC (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 277
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 278
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	337/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	692/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	561/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	924/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	548/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	748/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1104/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	751/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	665/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	630/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	675/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	872/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	35/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	62/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	118/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	99/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	64/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.46

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	5	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: MOTEL, BILLY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 279
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	337/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	692/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	561/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	924/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	548/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	748/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1104/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	741/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1082/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1008/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	828/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1099/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	35/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	62/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	118/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	99/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	64/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.46

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	5	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 280
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	624/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	910/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1062/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	685/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	654/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	943/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	657/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1009/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1036/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1128/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1163/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1112/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1018/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	922/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1182/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1194/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	36/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	83/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	151/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	88/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	149/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SADLER, JOSH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 281
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	624/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	910/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1062/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	685/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	654/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	943/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	657/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1258/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1308/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1373/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1324/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	922/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1182/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1194/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	36/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	83/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	151/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	88/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	149/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 282
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	962/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1231/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1022/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1348/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	374/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1118/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	1419/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	173/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	784/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1128/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	578/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	871/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1133/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	592/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	798/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	116/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	132/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	211/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	182/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	149/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 282
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: CHANDRASEKHARAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 283
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	3	5	4.20	962/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1231/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1022/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1348/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	374/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1118/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	1419/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	0	2	0	0	1.67	1481/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1409/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1415/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	1	1	0	2.13	1409/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	1	0	0	1.71	1408/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	592/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	798/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	116/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	132/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	211/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	182/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	149/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: CHANDRASEKHARAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 283
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 401 0101
 Title CHEM/STAT THERMODYNAMI
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 284
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	788/1504	4.33	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.60	3.60	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	412/1290	4.60	3.59	4.28	4.32	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	440/1453	4.50	3.76	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	863/1421	3.90	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	100/1365	4.86	3.75	4.08	4.09	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	150/1485	4.80	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1483	4.78	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.75	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	736/1418	4.38	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1416	5.00	3.56	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.52	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	858/1312	3.83	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	737/1303	4.33	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1025/1299	3.83	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 410 0101
 Title QUANTUM CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 285
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	669/1504	4.43	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1375/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	3.59	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1148/1453	3.83	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.60	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1225/1365	3.33	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1440/1485	2.67	3.60	4.16	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	731/1483	4.17	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1094/1425	4.17	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	623/1416	4.50	3.56	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	987/1199	3.33	3.52	3.97	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.13	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	3.71	4.01	4.17	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: DA SILVA, VERA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 286
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1173/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1340/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1116/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	6	1	3.46	1302/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1198/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	0	7	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1200/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	854/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	4	7	0	3.23	1332/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1250/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	1284/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	4	3	2	3.00	1330/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1205/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	946/1199	3.17	3.52	3.97	4.05	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	826/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1089/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	0	1	3.00	1194/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	126/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	162/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	4	3	3	1	3.09	215/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	3.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	121/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	4	3	3	0	2.73	204/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: DA SILVA, VERA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 286
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: BADHOU-PEAKER,P (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 287
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1173/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1340/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1116/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	6	1	3.46	1302/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1198/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	0	7	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1200/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	854/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1218/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1340/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1378/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1275/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1248/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	3.17	3.52	3.97	4.05	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	826/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1089/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	0	1	3.00	1194/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	126/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	162/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	4	3	3	1	3.09	215/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	3.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	121/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	4	3	3	0	2.73	204/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: BADHOU-PEAKER,P (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 287
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: BLOCKLIN,A (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 288
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1173/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1340/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1116/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	6	1	3.46	1302/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1198/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	0	7	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1200/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	854/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1267/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	3.17	3.52	3.97	4.05	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	826/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1089/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	0	1	3.00	1194/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	126/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	162/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	4	3	3	1	3.09	215/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	3.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	121/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	4	3	3	0	2.73	204/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: BLOCKLIN,A (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 288
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 289
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1173/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1340/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1116/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	6	1	3.46	1302/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1198/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	0	7	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1200/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	854/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1291/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1361/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	905/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1216/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	826/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1089/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	0	1	3.00	1194/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	126/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	162/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	4	3	3	1	3.09	215/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	3.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	121/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	4	3	3	0	2.73	204/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 289
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: DA SILVA, VERA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 290
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1092/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	1	1	3.10	1407/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1231/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	6	1	3.40	1333/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1359/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.53

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1129/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1197/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1250/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1268/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	2	0	1	3	2.89	1100/1199	3.17	3.52	3.97	4.05	2.89

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1209/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1168/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1166/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	116/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	226/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	2.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	149/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: BADHOU-PEAKER,P (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 291
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1092/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	1	1	3.10	1407/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1231/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	6	1	3.40	1333/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1359/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1327/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1373/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1209/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1168/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1166/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	116/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	226/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	2.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	149/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: BLOCKLIN,A (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 292
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1092/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	1	1	3.10	1407/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1231/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	6	1	3.40	1333/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1359/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	850/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.53

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1278/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1356/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1225/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1324/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1199	3.17	3.52	3.97	4.05	2.89

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1209/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1168/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1166/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	116/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	226/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	2.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	149/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 111
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 293
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	18	28	4.29	851/1504	4.29	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	14	25	11	3.75	1211/1503	3.75	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	18	22	8	3.53	1150/1290	3.53	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	42	1	3	4	3	3	3.29	1359/1453	3.29	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	7	15	14	13	3.62	1043/1421	3.62	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	2	0	7	5	2	3.31	1232/1365	3.31	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	4	11	9	28	4.06	964/1485	4.06	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	52	4.98	132/1504	4.98	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	23	21	4.25	635/1483	3.39	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	46	4.78	366/1425	3.87	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	47	4.80	738/1426	4.02	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.02
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	13	33	4.39	727/1418	3.49	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	2	13	34	4.35	799/1416	3.45	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	5	7	12	19	3.98	669/1199	3.64	3.52	3.97	4.05	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	3	1	6	2	2	2.93	1178/1312	2.93	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1175/1303	3.21	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1133/1299	3.43	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	43	8	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 2	Major 0

28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	24
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	8
84-150	37	3.00-3.49	15	D	1
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	16	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	2

General	1
Electives	1
Other	44

Under-grad	54	Non-major	56
------------	----	-----------	----

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 111
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 294
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	9	18	28	4.29	851/1504	4.29	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	14	25	11	3.75	1211/1503	3.75	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	18	22	8	3.53	1150/1290	3.53	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	42	1	3	4	3	3	3.29	1359/1453	3.29	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	7	15	14	13	3.62	1043/1421	3.62	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	2	0	7	5	2	3.31	1232/1365	3.31	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	4	11	9	28	4.06	964/1485	4.06	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	52	4.98	132/1504	4.98	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	12	12	18	6	3	2.53	1446/1483	3.39	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	10	12	13	10	10	2.96	1374/1425	3.87	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	8	7	14	16	10	3.24	1400/1426	4.02	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.02
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	10	15	18	9	2	2.59	1388/1418	3.49	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	4	16	11	12	4	8	2.55	1374/1416	3.45	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	9	5	11	7	15	3.30	999/1199	3.64	3.52	3.97	4.05	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	3	1	6	2	2	2.93	1178/1312	2.93	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1175/1303	3.21	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1133/1299	3.43	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	43	8	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 2	Major 0

28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	24
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	8
84-150	37	3.00-3.49	15	D	1
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	16	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	2

General	1
Electives	1
Other	44

Under-grad	54	Non-major	56
------------	----	-----------	----

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 455 0101
 Title INTRO BIOMEDICINAL CHE
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 295
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	37	4.72	295/1504	4.72	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	35	4.72	248/1503	4.72	3.60	4.20	4.18	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	38	4.81	201/1290	4.81	3.59	4.28	4.32	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	32	4.64	300/1453	4.64	3.76	4.21	4.22	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	2	2	9	29	4.55	290/1421	4.55	3.67	4.00	4.02	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	17	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	193/1365	4.65	3.75	4.08	4.09	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	14	27	4.51	444/1485	4.51	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	31	13	4.30	1248/1504	4.30	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	3	9	21	4.55	306/1483	4.55	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	37	4.82	315/1425	4.82	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	39	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	36	4.75	261/1418	4.75	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	7	36	4.77	296/1416	4.77	3.56	4.26	4.26	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	4	9	27	4.49	290/1199	4.49	3.52	3.97	4.05	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	512/1312	4.36	3.33	4.00	4.07	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.13	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	32	4	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	18 Under-grad 47 Non-major 41
84-150	22	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	18

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 296
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	482/1504	4.19	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1503	4.08	3.60	4.20	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	459/1290	3.92	3.59	4.28	4.32	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1421	3.97	3.67	4.00	4.02	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	451/1365	3.13	3.75	4.08	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1485	3.99	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	751/1483	3.91	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1425	4.80	3.94	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	4.42	4.11	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	378/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.29	3.56	4.26	4.26	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	329/1199	3.60	3.52	3.97	4.05	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	444/1312	3.48	3.33	4.00	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.24	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	3.90	3.13	4.25	4.38	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	63/ 233	3.92	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	97/ 244	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.56	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	113/ 227	4.35	4.16	4.40	4.16	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	140/ 225	3.54	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	46/ 207	3.42	3.84	4.09	3.69	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 297
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.19	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1183/1503	4.08	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1131/1290	3.92	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1056/1421	3.97	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1347/1365	3.13	3.75	4.08	4.09	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1246/1485	3.99	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	635/1483	3.91	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.80	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1268/1426	4.42	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1145/1416	4.29	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1115/1199	3.60	3.52	3.97	4.05	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.48	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	910/1303	4.24	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1106/1299	3.90	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	185/ 233	3.92	3.96	4.09	3.78	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	206/ 244	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	167/ 227	4.35	4.16	4.40	4.16	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	202/ 225	3.54	3.95	4.23	3.81	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	197/ 207	3.42	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 298
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.19	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1183/1503	4.08	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1131/1290	3.92	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1056/1421	3.97	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1347/1365	3.13	3.75	4.08	4.09	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1246/1485	3.99	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.91	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1425	4.80	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1319/1426	4.42	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1330/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1416	4.29	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.48	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	910/1303	4.24	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1106/1299	3.90	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	185/ 233	3.92	3.96	4.09	3.78	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	206/ 244	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	167/ 227	4.35	4.16	4.40	4.16	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	202/ 225	3.54	3.95	4.23	3.81	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	197/ 207	3.42	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490 0101
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN CHEM
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 299
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	684/1504	4.41	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	403/1503	4.59	3.60	4.20	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	800/1290	4.24	3.59	4.28	4.32	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	230/1453	4.71	3.76	4.21	4.22	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	7	3	3.53	1101/1421	3.53	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	237/1365	4.58	3.75	4.08	4.09	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	190/1485	4.76	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	818/1425	4.47	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.11	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	790/1418	4.31	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	11	5	4.18	937/1416	4.18	3.56	4.26	4.26	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	412/1199	4.36	3.52	3.97	4.05	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	502/1312	4.36	3.33	4.00	4.07	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.91	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	385/1299	4.73	3.13	4.25	4.38	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	66/ 758	4.89	3.71	4.01	4.17	4.89
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 610 0101
 Title SPEC TOP:THEORETICL CH
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 300
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	1	3.50	1353/1504	3.50	3.80	4.27	4.44	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1304/1503	3.50	3.60	4.20	4.28	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	3.76	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	967/1421	3.75	3.67	4.00	4.27	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.75	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	3.60	4.16	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	3.64	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1334/1425	3.33	3.94	4.41	4.51	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.11	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.00	3.68	4.25	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1281/1416	3.33	3.56	4.26	4.38	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1197/1199	1.00	3.52	3.97	4.04	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1247/1312	2.50	3.33	4.00	4.31	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.14	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.13	4.25	4.56	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 663 0101
 Title ANALYTICAL SEPARATIONS
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 301
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	3.80	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	649/1503	4.40	3.60	4.20	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	832/1290	4.20	3.59	4.28	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	331/1453	4.60	3.76	4.21	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	247/1421	4.60	3.67	4.00	4.27	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	223/1365	4.60	3.75	4.08	4.35	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	591/1485	4.40	3.60	4.16	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	700/1483	4.20	3.64	4.06	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	3.94	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.11	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	450/1418	4.60	3.68	4.25	4.36	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	3.56	4.26	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.52	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	465/1312	4.40	3.33	4.00	4.31	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	3.14	4.24	4.58	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	3.13	4.25	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	84/ 758	4.80	3.71	4.01	4.24	4.80

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

Course-Section: CHEM 672 0101
 Title ENZYME REACTION MECH'I
 Instructor: POLLACK, RALPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 302
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	396/1504	4.63	3.80	4.27	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	692/1503	4.38	3.60	4.20	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	937/1290	4.00	3.59	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1123/1453	3.88	3.76	4.21	4.34	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	690/1365	4.14	3.75	4.08	4.35	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1257/1485	3.57	3.60	4.16	4.24	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.67	3.64	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1117/1425	4.38	3.94	4.41	4.51	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.11	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	736/1418	4.56	3.68	4.25	4.36	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1416	4.50	3.56	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.52	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.33	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.14	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.13	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.71	4.01	4.24	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.41	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I 0
? 0

Other

1

Course-Section: CHEM 672 0101
 Title ENZYME REACTION MECH'I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 303
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	396/1504	4.63	3.80	4.27	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	692/1503	4.38	3.60	4.20	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	937/1290	4.00	3.59	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1123/1453	3.88	3.76	4.21	4.34	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	690/1365	4.14	3.75	4.08	4.35	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1257/1485	3.57	3.60	4.16	4.24	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	4.67	3.64	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	634/1425	4.38	3.94	4.41	4.51	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.11	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	261/1418	4.56	3.68	4.25	4.36	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	498/1416	4.50	3.56	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.52	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.33	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.14	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.13	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.71	4.01	4.24	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.41	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I 0
? 0

Other

1