Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	-	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins† Mean	tructor Rank			-		Level Mean	
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	6	4	7	5	3 20	1595/16	74	3 55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	11	5			1590/16			3.76	4.23	4.16	3.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	9	4	4			1417/14			3.53	4.27	4.16	2.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	3	3	3	3			1583/16		3.07		4.22	4.05	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	1	4	5	б	3.18	1392/15	85	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		19	2	1	3	0			****/15			3.77		3.89	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	9			1434/16				4.18	4.10	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0 2	0 2	0	2			635/16			4.89		4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	s 10	0	2	2	3	7	Ţ	3.20	1494/16	56	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.13
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	1074/15	86	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	б	14	4.39	1315/15	85	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	4				1352/15		3.59			4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	3				1367/15		3.49		4.27	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	3	1	6	7	3.55	1017/13	80	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.97
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	2	9	4	3	2.76	1432/15	20	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	4	2	11	6	3.60	1274/15	15	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	2	4	8	8		1274/15					4.00	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	3	4	10	2	5	3.08	875/ 9	94	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.08
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 2	65	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	n 24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 2	78	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 2	60	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 2	59	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00				2.33			* * * *
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/	61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	1	0	1	0	0				3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00			* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *
Free Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	quency 3	7 Dis	tribi		n asons	3				Туре	2			Majors	5
								 2				• • • • • • •			
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 1 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 8		Re	quire	∃a I	or Ma	Jor	5	2	Gradu	ale		0	Majc	)Τ.	0
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2		Gei	neral	L				1	Under	-gra	ad 2	5	Non-	major	25
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0		_						_							
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 P 0		El	ectiv	/es				2						enoug	ŋh
P 0 I 0		0+1	her					7	respo	uses	ιυ Δ	e sign	iiiican	IL	
? 1								,							

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor		Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did vou gain	new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	6	4	7	5	3.20	1595/1	.674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.20
	ructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	11	5	4		1590/1		3.53		4.23	4.16	3.16
	questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	9	4	4	1	2.32	1417/1	423	3.03		4.27	4.16	2.32
	aluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	3	3	3	3			1583/1		3.07		4.22	4.05	2.86
	readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	1	4	5	б	3.18	1392/1	585	3.63		3.96	3.88	3.18
6. Did written	assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	****/1	535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	* * * *
7. Was the grad	ing system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	9	б	3.52	1434/1	651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.52
	es was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	635/1	673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.92
9. How would yo	u grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	0	8	5	0	3.07	1531/1	656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.13
	Lecture															
1. Were the ins	tructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	1300/1	586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.17
	ructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	1434/1	585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.28
3. Was lecture w	material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	2	5	2	4	3.00	1504/1	582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.33
4. Did the lect	ures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	3	4	2	5	3.18	1462/1	575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.34
5. Did audiovis	ual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	4	2	1	2	1	2.40	1338/1	380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.97
	Discussion															
1. Did class di	scussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	2	9	4	3	2.76	1432/1	520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.76
2. Were all stu	dents actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	4	2	11	6	3.60	1274/1	515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.60
3. Did the inst	ructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	2	4	8	8	3.64	1274/1	511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.64
4. Were special	. Were special techniques successful						2	5	3.08	875/	994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.08
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab	increase understanding of the material	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
	vided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
	ry materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab	instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
	Seminar															
4. Did presenta	tions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
	Field Work															
1. Did field ex	perience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
	rly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/		2.33				* * * *
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-pac	ed system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/	61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
_	estions make clear the expected goal	23	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/		3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
	ntacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
-	back/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	Ő	0	1	0	0		****/		3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
	nough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/		3.17			3.88	* * * *
		quenc	y Di	strik	outi	on										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	5			R	easor	ıs				ТΣ	ype			Major	ŝ
00-27 3	0.00-0.99 1 A 1		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5 5	2	Grad	luate	 2	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 2	1.00-1.99 0 B 8															
56-83 1	2.00-2.99 0 C 2		Ge	neral	L				1	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	25	Non-	major	25
84-150 1																
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 1 F 0 P 0		El	ectiv	<i>v</i> es				2			Means t			-	ŋh
	р 0 І 0		0+	her					7	resp	UISE	es to b	e sign	urrrcar.	16	
		UL.	TIGT					1								

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie: 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	8	4	2 50	1483/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3 4	6	。 12	4		1550/1674	3.55	3.76	4.27	4.07	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	8	5	3	3		1374/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	2	2	2	1		1591/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	926/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	1	4	2	0		1475/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	3	3	8	2		1576/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20		353/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	3	7	3	0	3.00	1540/1656		3.66	4.07	3.96	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	12	5	3.82	1397/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	2	б	10	4.10	1456/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	7	9	0	3.05	1500/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	5	7	2		1480/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	4	1	3	5	2	3.00	1217/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	5	3	5		1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	5	7	4		1333/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2 4	7	3	6	3		1414/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.05
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	4	2	5	6	3.24	839/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	255/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	227/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	137/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	2	0	0	1	1	3		****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	б	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar		_	_			_	_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	5	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work	1 5	0	0	0	-	2	-	2 1 4		0 51	0 51	2 00	2 20	2 1 4
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	56/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	3.14
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16 16	0 3	1 1	2 0	2	1 0	0	2.50	74/ 77 ****/ 53	2.33 ****	2.33 ****	3.93	3.42	2.50 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		3			1 0	-	1	2.33		****	****	4.45	4.34 4.00	****
<ol> <li>To what degree could you discuss your evaluations</li> <li>Did conferences help you carry out field activities</li> </ol>	16 16	5	2 0	0	0	0 1	1 0		****/ 49	****	****	4.12 4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	5	0	0	0	T	0	4.00	****/ 49			4.2/	4.30	~ ~ ~ ~ ~
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	53/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	47/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	3.29
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	5	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	31/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	3.71
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	29/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	3.17

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 0102	University of Maryland	Page 256
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PAPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	33		
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	б	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

			-			Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	8	4	3.59	1483/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	б	12	0	3.36	1550/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	8	5	3	3	2.95	1374/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	1591/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	б	7	4	3.88	926/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1475/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	3	3	8	2	2.95	1576/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1486/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	826/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	1309/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	4	4	4		1420/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1240/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	770/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	5	3	5	3.05	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	5	7	4		1333/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	7	3	6	3		1414/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.05
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	4	2	5	6	3.24	839/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94		3.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	255/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	227/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	137/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	2	0	0	1	1	3		****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	6	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
5. Were requirements for fus reports creatly specifica	10	0	0	-	0	Ū	0	2.00	/ 200		1.02	1.20	1.00	
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.41	4.33	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	1	1	2	0		****/ 97		3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	3	0	T	T	2	0	3.25		3.50	3.03	4.14	5.09	
Field Work		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	56/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	3.14
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	74/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	2.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	3	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	3	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	, ==	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	53/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	47/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	3.29
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	5	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	31/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	3.71
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	29/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	3.17

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 0102	University of Maryland	Page 257
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara(Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	33		
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	10	10	0	3.17	1603/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	8	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	5	3	8	3.29	1324/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	4	3	3	7	0	2.76	1591/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	7	6	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1366/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	6	10	3.88	1246/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	12	5	1	3.10	1527/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	7	۵	4 05	1280/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	7	10		1383/1585		4.30	4.69	4.60	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	5	10	2		1446/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	5	10	5		1439/1575		3.70	4.20	4.17	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	2	4	4	4		1108/1380		3.62	3.94	3.78	3.71
5. Did additivisdal techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	2	4	4	-	3.30	1108/1380	3.40	3.02	5.94	5.70	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	9	3	4	3.04	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	б	7	7	3.78	1191/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	9	5	5	3.35	1348/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	3	7	б	3	3.04	878/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.04

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	А	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	10	10	0	3.17	1603/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	8	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	5	3	8	3.29	1324/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	4	3	3	7	0	2.76	1591/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	7	6	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1366/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	6	10	3.88	1246/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	8	8	2	3.40	1421/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	З	Q	11	4 36	1044/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	8	11		1335/1585		4.30	4.69	4.60	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	8	5		1290/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	4	7	7		1240/1575		3.70	4.27	4.17	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	2	5	11	4.05	648/1380		3.62	3.94	3.78	3.71
5. Dia additividual cecimiques cimanee your anacistanaing	-	2	2	-	2	5		1.05	010/1000	5.10	5.02	5.91	5.70	5.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	9	3	4	3.04	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	6	7	7	3.78	1191/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	9	5	5	3.35	1348/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	3	7	6	3	3.04	878/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.04

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	А	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Questions			Fre 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	9	4	7	2 7 2	1420/1674	2 55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9 10	4 8	3		1420/1674		3.87	4.27	4.07	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	2	4		1386/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	3	0	4	3	0		1596/1609		3.67		4.05	2.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	6	6	5		1066/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	2	1		1342/1535		3.77	4.08	3.89	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	11	б		1162/1651		3.82	4.18	4.10	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	7	10	0	3.35	1438/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	8	9		1198/1586		4.17	4.43	4.37	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3			1150/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	6	6	7		1340/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	8			1339/1575			4.27	4.17	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	б	2	3	4	2	5	3.31	1137/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	8	6	3.95	867/1520		3.40	4.01	3.76	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	432/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2		13	4.52	626/1511		3.57		4.00	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	2	0	3	5	11	4.10	447/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	4.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * * * * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	2 2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	~ ~ ^ ^
Seminar	0.0	-	0	•	-	0	~	2 00	**** / 100		4 1 1	4 47	4 2 2	* * * *
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0 0	0 0	1 0	0 1	0 0		****/ 103	3.33 ****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
<ol> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	20 20	1 1	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 101 ****/ 99	3.33	4.50 3.78	4.48 4.39	4.18 4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.39	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made creat	20	T	0	T	0	0	0	2.00		3.50	5.05	4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 52		3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	2	0	0	Ţ	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 0104	University of Maryland	Page 260
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PAPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	36		
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B) Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 22

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Questions			Fre 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins <sup>:</sup> Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	9	4	7	3 73	1420/1674	3 5 5	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	Ő	1	10	8	3		1455/1674		3.76	4.23	4.16	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	2	4		1386/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	3	0	4	3	0		1596/1609	3.07	3.67		4.05	2.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	6	6	5		1066/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	2	1		1342/1535		3.77	4.08	3.89	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	11	б	3.95	1162/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	7	9	1	3.42	1412/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	974/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	13		1166/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	7	7		1272/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	6	9		1264/1575			4.27	4.17	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	540/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	8	6	3.95	867/1520	3.14		4.01	3.76	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	432/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	, .		3.57			4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	2	0	3	5	11	4.10	447/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	4.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 99		3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104	University of Maryland	Page 261
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 36		
Questionnaires: 22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie: 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	7	2	3.33	1563/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	7	6	2	3.10	1599/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	9	2	1	2.65	1406/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	4	7	2	3	3.00	1557/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	4	3	б	2	3.00	1440/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	3	4	4	1	3.08	1430/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	6	6	4		1504/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	7	4	0	3.15	1510/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	4	11		1255/1586		4.17	4.43	4.37	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	5	4	10		1472/1585		4.30	4.69	4.60	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	6	7	5		1367/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	7	6	4		1437/1575		3.70	4.27	4.17	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	6	1	5	4	1	2.59	1313/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	6	6	2		1343/1520		3.40	4.01	3.76	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	759/1515		3.53	4.24	3.97	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	8	7	3		1308/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	1	6	8	2	3.25	835/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	3	1	2	4	0	0	2.43	264/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	2.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	4	0	3	3	0	2.50	276/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	4	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	241/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	3	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	251/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	95/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	3.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75		****	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	5 2	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13 13	2	0 0	1 0	3 3	1 3	1 0	3.33 3.50	91/ 99 77/ 97	3.33 3.50	3.78 3.83	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	3.33 3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	2	0	0	3	5	0	3.50	11/ 91	3.50	3.03	4.14	5.09	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	0	1	1	0	1.83	75/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	1.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	77/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50		* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	58/ 61		2.94	4.09	3.87	2.83
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	51/ 52		3.13	4.26	3.91	2.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	1	3	1	0		****/ 50	****	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 0106
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
Instructor:	PAPENMEIER, DOU
Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	21

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Questions			Fre 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	1	0	1	F	-	0	4	2 4 2	1 - 41 / 1 - 74	2 55	2 07	4 07	4.07	3.42
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	1 1	0 0	1 2	5 1	5 7	9 10	4 4		1541/1674 1479/1674		3.87 3.76	4.27 4.23	4.07 4.16	3.42 3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	12	2		1326/1423		3.53	4.23	4.16	3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	2	1	2	7	2		1477/1609		3.67	4.22	4.05	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	838/1585		3.69	3.96	3.88	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	3	5	1		1240/1535		3.77	4.08	3.89	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	10			1149/1651		3.82	4.18	4.10	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	283/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	12	5	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	1335/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	5	9	6		1489/1585		4.30	4.69	4.60	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	5	11	3		1326/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	5	7	5			1474/1575			4.27	4.17	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	3	4	7	1	1	2.56	1316/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	б	9	2		1345/1520			4.01	3.76	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	4	10	5		1279/1515		3.53	4.24	3.97	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	7	9	4		1330/1511				4.00	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	3	3	5	8	3	3.23	842/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	3	0	1	1	0		****/ 265		4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	1	2	1	0		****/ 278		4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 103		4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * * * * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 95		4.50	4.31	3.99	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	20 20	3 3	0 0	0 0	1 1	1 1	0 0		****/ 99 ****/ 97		3.78 3.83	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	3	0	0	T	T	0	3.50	~~~/ 9/	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	3	0	0		****/ 76		2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	2	0	3	0	0		****/ 77		2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53		* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	3	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 48		* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	3	0	0		****/ 61		2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52		3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50		* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	3	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 35		3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 0107	University of Maryland	Page 263
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PAPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	37		
Questionnaires:	25	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	lits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade			ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	б	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				?	0						

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins† Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	1	0	1	5	5	9	4	2 4 2	1541/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4 07	2 4 2
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	1 1	0 0	2	5	5	9 10	4 4		1479/1674		3.87	4.27	4.07 4.16	3.42 3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	12	2		1326/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	2	1	2	7	2		1477/1609		3.67		4.05	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	838/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	3	5	1		1240/1535		3.77	4.08	3.89	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	10	8		1149/1651		3.82	4.18	4.10	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	283/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	6	7	6	3.71	1267/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46			4.17	4.43	4.37	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	15		1225/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	7	10		1129/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1 2	4	4 1	3	5	7		1432/1575		3.70	4.27	4.17	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	T	4	5	10	3.91	796/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	6	9	2		1345/1520			4.01	3.76	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	4	10	5		1279/1515		3.53	4.24	3.97	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	7	9	4		1330/1511		3.57		4.00	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	3	3	5	8	3	3.23	842/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	3	0	1	1	0		****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	1	2	1	0		****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2 3	0 0	0 0	1 1	2	0		****/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	3	0	0	T	1	0	3.50	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * * * * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20 20	3 3	0 0	0 0	1 1	1 1	0		****/ 99 ****/ 97		3.78	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	3	U	0	T	T	0	3.50		3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	~ ~ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	3	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	3	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	3	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107	University of Maryland	Page 264
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 37		
Questionnaires: 25	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	10	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				?	0						

				Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	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	4	8	5	5	3.29	1574/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.29
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	б	6	3.42	1535/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.42
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	4	7	2	2.75	1401/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.75
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	3	4	б	2	3.31	1504/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.31
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	б	7	3	3.45	1260/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.45
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1435/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.00
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	7	7	5	3.52	1434/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.52
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	3	4	5	2	0	2.43	1625/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.75
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	8	3	7	3.45	1489/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.75
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	11	5	3.86	1515/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.01
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	5	5	4	2	2.75	1548/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.11
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	5	2	2	3	2.35	1556/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.01
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	6	2	3	0	2	2.23	1348/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.02
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	3	4	5	2	2.42	1479/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.42
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	2	б	8	6	3.58	1279/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.58
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	5	3	7	3	6	3.08	1408/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.08
	Were special techniques successful	0	0	7	3	4	3	7	3.00	881/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.00
	Laboratory														

2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 278 3.31 4.08 4.19 3.97 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	б	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0108 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B) Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 24

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NA		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	4	8	5	5	3.29	1574/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	б	б	3.42	1535/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	4	7	2	2.75	1401/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	3	4	6	2	3.31	1504/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	6	7	3	3.45	1260/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1435/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	7	7	5	3.52	1434/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	2	4	5	1	3.07	1530/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	1	1	5	10	4.05	1275/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	1437/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.01
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	7	б	3	3.47	1416/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1329/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	б	2	2	0	5	1	8	3.81	859/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	3	4	5	2	2.42	1479/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	2	6	8	б	3.58	1279/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	5	3	7	3	6	3.08	1408/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.08
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	7	3	4	3	7	3.00	881/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.00
Laboratory														
	~ ~	~	~	-	~	~	~	0 00	****	2 21	4 0 0	4 1 0	2 0 7	de de de de

2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 278 3.31 4.08 4.19 3.97 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	б	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	7	7	9	3	3.22	1590/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	9	7	9	2		1593/1674		3.76	4.23	4.16	3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	10	2	4	3	2.41	1413/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	4	7	6	4	1	2.59	1599/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	5	3	8	4	3.32	1339/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	4	5	2	1	2.60	1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	1	б	7	7		1450/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	1			887/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	8	6	1	3.53	1362/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	5	б	11	4.08	1260/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	11	10	4.20	1423/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	9	8	4	3.57	1385/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	2	6	7	4	3.32	1429/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	5	5	5	3	3.33	1127/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	12	б	2	2.96	1377/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	14	5	4	3.31	1370/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	7	8	б	3.54	1302/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	5	1	5	4	8	3.39	787/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.39
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
<ol><li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li></ol>	24	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	0		****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 0112	University of Maryland	Page 267
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PAPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	33		
Questionnaires:	27	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	asons Type				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	б						

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre 1	eque 2	ncie: 3	з 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	7	7	9	3		1590/1674		3.87	4.27	4.07	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	9	7	9	2		1593/1674		3.76	4.23	4.16	3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	10	2	4	3		1413/1423		3.53	4.27	4.16	2.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5 5	4 2	7 5	6 3	4	1 4		1599/1609		3.67 3.69	4.22 3.96	4.05 3.88	2.59 3.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0				3 5	8	4		1339/1585					
<ol> <li>Did written assignments contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1 1	11 1	3 4	4 1	5	2 7	1 7		1503/1535 1450/1651		3.77 3.82	4.08 4.18	3.89 4.10	2.60 3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	4	0	0	1	24		887/1673		3.82 4.89	4.10	4.10	3.40 4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	⊥ 3	2	3	2	24		1627/1656			4.09	3.96	2.97
5. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Ξ,	0	5	2	5	2	0	2.10	1027/1050	5.55	5.00	1.07	5.90	2.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	6	4	9	4.05	1275/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	3	8	7		1472/1585		4.30	4.69	4.60	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	2	4	6	3		1495/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	1	3	6	3		1505/1575		3.70	4.27	4.17	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	б	0	1	5	5	3.18	1187/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	12	6	2	2.96	1377/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	14	5	4	3.31	1370/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	7	8	б	3.54	1302/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	5	1	5	4	8	3.39	787/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.39
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	2	0	1	0	0	1 67	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23 24	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 278		4.13	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 233		4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
Seminar	~ 4	0	~	~	-	0	0	1 60	**** ( 100	2 22	4 1 1	4 4 7	4 2 2	* * * *
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0 0	2	0 0	1 1	0 0	0 1		****/ 103	3.33 ****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
<ol> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	24 24	0	1 1	0	1 2	0	0		****/ 101 ****/ 95		4.50 4.50	4.48 4.31	4.18 3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24 24	1	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 99	3.33	4.50 3.78	4.31 4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24 24	1	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 97		3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
5. Were effectia for grading made erear	21	-	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	/ 5/	5.50	5.05	1.11	5.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0112	University of Maryland	Page 268
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 33		
Questionnaires: 27	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	6						

							Instructor	Course De	ot UM	BC Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Rank	Mean Me	an Me	an Mean	Mean
General												
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	R	13	1	3.57 1492/1674	3.55 3.	37 4.	27 4.07	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	9	6	3.70 1406/1674				3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	6	6	5	3.35 1313/1423				3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	3	8	5	0	3.13 1546/1609				3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	7	7	ں ۲	3.40 1297/1585				3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	3	3	1	3.11 1425/1535				3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05 1070/1651				4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	21	5.00 1/1673				5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	6	5	5	3.82 1184/1656				3.47
-												
Lecture	1	0	~	0	2	2	10		4 1 0 4		42 4 27	4 1 1
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	16	4.59 763/1586				4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	T	0	0 1	⊥ 3	2	3 8	16	4.55 1191/1585				4.27 3.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	-	⊥ 2	3	0	8	10	3.71 1326/1582				
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	_	1	2	4	12	4.10 1103/1575				3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	T	3	8	8	4.15 576/1380	3.40 3.	52 3.	94 3.78	3.35
Discussion												
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	5	9	1	3.00 1353/1520	3.14 3.	40 4.	01 3.76	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	3	б	9	3.91 1137/1515	3.84 3.	53 4.	24 3.97	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	7	8	6	3.86 1161/1511	3.62 3.	57 4.	27 4.00	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	3	3	3	7	5	3.38 791/ 994	3.39 3.	16 3.	94 3.73	3.38
Laboratory												
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/ 265	2.92 4.	L3 4.	23 3.97	* * * *

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	б	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	3						

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	8	13	1	3.57	1492/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	9	6	3.70	1406/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	б	б	5	3.35	1313/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	3	8	5	0	3.13	1546/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	7	7	3	3.40	1297/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1425/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	б	6	9	4.05	1070/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	3	8	3	2	3.12	1522/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1454/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	б	5	6	4.00	1472/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1314/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	1429/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	б	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1317/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	5	9	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	3	6	9		1137/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	7	8	6	3.86	1161/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	3	3	3	7	5	3.38	791/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	б	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	3						

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins† Mean	ructor Rank	5	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1 0	0	3	4	9 3		1046/16			3.87	4.27	4.07	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	•	-	-	1	-	10	-		1284/16		3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0 5	4 2	3 1	4 3	4	2		1396/14		3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.82 3.25
<ol> <li>Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</li> <li>Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	0 0	5 4	2 0	1	3 4	4 3	∠ 5		1517/16 879/15		3.07 3.63	3.67 3.69	4.22 3.96	4.05 3.88	3.25 3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	2	1	0		1503/15		3.03	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	3	6	-		1246/16		3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1			424/16			4.89	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	5			1444/16			3.66		3.96	3.61
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	8	5		1275/15			4.17	4.43	4.37	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	9	6		1406/15		4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	8	5			1483/15		3.59	3.81		4.17	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	8			1462/15		3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1184/13	880	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.86
Discussion	_		_	_	_		_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	4			1269/15		3.14		4.01	3.76	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	3	1	4	8		1145/15		3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0 0	0	2 2	1 1	3 2	3 7	8		1183/15		3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	T	Z	/	5	3./1	002/ 9	94	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.71
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 2	070	3.31	1 0 0	1 10	3.97	* * * *
	10	0	0	0	0	Ŧ	0	4.00		.70	3.31	4.00	4.19	3.97	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0			99		3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0			53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced				_		_	_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0			61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0			52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0			50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16		0 at wil	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	3.71	3./1	4.36	3.92	~ ~ ~ ~
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	quenc 5	Y DI:	SLLI		easo	ns				Ту	уре			Major	S
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Rev	quire	 ad fr	 זר M		 9	0	Gradu		 >	 0	Majc		
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 6		1.64	JUTI		JI 1910	، ۲۰ ر م	0	0	Gradu	auc	-	0	1.10	-	0
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 3		Gei	nera	L				0	Under	-qr	rad 1	7	Non-	major	17
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 1										5-				5 -	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 1		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	####	- 1	<i>l</i> eans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0									respo	nse	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
- 0		0+1	la				1	4							

Other

I

?

0

1

14

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B) Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 17

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	3	4	9	4.18	1046/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	Ő	Ő	0	1	3	10	3		1284/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	Ő	4	3	4	4	2		1396/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	3	4	2		1517/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	4	3	5		879/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	2	1	0		1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	3	6	5		1246/1651		3.82	4.18	4.10	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1139/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	853/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	829/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	5	б	4.31	915/1575	3.49		4.27	4.17	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	284/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	4	4	3.29	1269/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	Ő	1	3	1	4	8		1145/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	Ő	2	1	3	3	8		1183/1511		3.57	4.27	4.00	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	1	2	7	5		662/ 994				3.73	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 97		3.83		3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	3.71	3.71		3.92	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F P	1 0	Electives	1	#### - Means responses to		are not enoug nificant	h

I 0 Other 14 ? 1

			Fre	aue	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General	-	_	-	_	_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	9	10	2		1528/1674		3.87		4.07	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	11	3		1479/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	6			1359/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10 7	1	3	3	7	0		1541/1609	3.07		4.22	4.05	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0		2 2	4	3	4	4		1372/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.24
<ol> <li>Did written assignments contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	14 1	2 1	2 2	4	2 8	9		1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08 4.18	3.89 4.10	2.60 3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	∠ 0	3 0	8	-		1162/1651 635/1673	3.67 4.95	3.82 4.89	4.18	4.10	3.96 4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	14	2			1533/1656		4.89 3.66	4.09		4.91 3.42
9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	ч	0	0	5	14	2	Т	3.05	1933/1030	5.55	3.00	4.07	3.90	5.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	9	4	б	3.55	1472/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	7	8	4	3.59	1546/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	13	6	0	3.09	1495/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	б	8	3	2	2.77	1530/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	5	5	0	3	2.80	1280/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	9	3	4	3 09	1337/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	7	4	11	4.09	999/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	5	10	7		1050/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	8	5	4			937/ 994				3.73	
I Here Special committee Successian	-	-	-	Ũ	0	-	-	2.01	507, 551	0.00	5.10	5.51	5.75	2.01
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	0	0	1	0		****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
<ol><li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li></ol>	21	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 99	3.33		4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97		3.83		3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 0203	University of Maryland	Page 273
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PAPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	30		
Questionnaires:	24	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	10	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	з 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
~														
General								~	1 - 0 0 / 1 / - 1					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0 0	0 1	3 2	9 7	10	2		1528/1674		3.87	4.27	4.07	3.46
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0 0	0	1 2	∠ 5	9	11 6	3 2		1479/1674 1359/1423	3.53 3.03	3.76 3.53	4.23 4.27	4.16 4.16	3.54 3.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	3	3	7	2 0		1541/1609	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.10	3.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	4	3	4	4		1372/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	, 14	2	2	4	2	0		1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	8	9		1162/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	21		635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	10	3	3.80	1200/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52		4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6	14		1250/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	7	6	7		1336/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	8	6		1377/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	5	6	6	3.65	968/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	9	3	4	3.09	1337/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	7	4	11	4.09	999/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	5	10	7		1050/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	8	5	4	2	2.81	937/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	2.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	2	0	0	2	0		****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	0	0	1	0		****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * * * * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	2 2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 259	3.00 ****	4.19	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	~ ~ ~ ~	4.02	4.20	4.00	~ ~ ^ ^
Seminar						-								* * * *
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0 0	1	0		****/ 103	3.33 ****	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1 1	1 0	0	0	0 0	0		****/ 101 ****/ 95	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22 22	1	0	1 1	0	0	0		****/ 95 ****/ 99	3.33	4.50 3.78	4.31 4.39	3.99 4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.39	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were errerita for grading made erear	22	-	0	0	-	0	0	5.00	/ )/	5.50	5.05	1.11	5.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203	University of Maryland	Page 274
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 30		
Questionnaires: 24	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits E	s Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons					Туре	Majors				
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> </ol>	0	0	0	3	3	б	8	3.95	1259/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	8		1035/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	5	6	3.70	1192/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	б	5	1	3.06	1553/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	926/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	4	5	2		1324/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1303/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0		4.89	724/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	6	9	2	3.76	1230/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	12	1 27	1044/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	13		1208/1585	4.10	4.17	4.43	4.57	4.40
	1	0	0	1	3 5	3 4	13 9		,	4.29 3.59			4.60	4.51 4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	4 7	9		1079/1582 1244/1575			4.26		4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	⊥ 2	-		-			3.49		4.27	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	T	4	0	2	6	2	5	3.67	962/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	9	4	3.72	1051/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	827/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	927/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	432/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 265	2.92	4.13		3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work						-								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.17			3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 0204	University of Maryland	Page 275
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PAPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	30		
Questionnaires:	20	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	8	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B) Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 20

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	6	8	3 95	1259/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	8		1035/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	5	-		1192/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	6	5	1		1553/1609	3.03	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	9	1	3.88	926/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	∠ 3	2 4	5	4		1324/1535	3.05	3.09	4.08	3.89	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	6			1303/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0		4.89	724/1673		4.89	4.18	4.10	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	6		4.20	794/1656		3.66			3.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	T	0	0	3	0	0	4.20	/94/1050	3.35	3.00	4.07	5.90	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	805/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	1225/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	850/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	867/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	4	2	б	3.79	880/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	0	4	2 7 2	1051/1500	2 1 4	2 40	4.01	2 76	2 7 2
-	2	0	2 0	1	3	9			1051/1520	3.14	3.40		3.76	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2 2	0	0	1	3 4	3	11 10	4.33	827/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2 2	2	1	1	4	3 4	10		927/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.22 4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	Ţ	0	3	4	8	4.13	432/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97		3.83		3.69	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made creat	тJ	0	0	0	0	Т	0	4.00	/ 5/	5.50	5.05	1.11	5.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31		3.17		3.88	* * * *
5. Here chere chough proceers for all the scutells	19	U	0	0	±	0	U	5.00	/ 51	5.11	5.11	1.71	5.00	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 20

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	8	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	-	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	9	13	4	3.55	1495/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	10	6	7	3.45	1523/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	14	7	1	3.04	1360/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	1	7	2	1	2.92	1573/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	7	11	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1398/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	6	10	7	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	13	9	1	3.48	1390/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	10	13	4.27	1136/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	7	18		1083/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	8	12	5		1228/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	8	10	5		1374/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	6	3	6	3	3		1298/1380		3.62	3.94	3.78	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	10	6	6	2 / 1	1221/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2 0	3	10 3	12	9		1024/1515	3.14		4.01	3.97	3.41 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	2 7	12	11		1150/1511	3.62	3.55	4.24	4.00	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	4	7	7	7	3.58	708/ 994		3.46	3.94		3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	2	Ŧ	Ŧ	7	/	/	/	3.50	708/ 994	3.39	3.40	5.94	5.75	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information			1	0	0	0	0		****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities			1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance			1	0	0	0	0		****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	7	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

ND	NTA		-		s	F				-			Sect Mean
NR					4			Ralik		Mean		Mean	Mean
0	0	2	1	9	13	4	3.55	1495/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.55
0	0	1	5	10	6	7	3.45	1523/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.45
1	0	2	4	14	7	1	3.04	1360/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.04
2	14	2	1	7	2	1	2.92	1573/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.92
2	б	0	1	7	11	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.67
d 2	18	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1398/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.22
2	0	2	2	6	10	7	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.67
2	2	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
s 7	1	0	0	9	11	1	3.62	1324/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.55
3	0	0	1	2	9	14		. ,		4.17	4.43	4.37	4.33
3	0	0	0	2	7	17		,	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.62
	-	-		9	10	5						4.17	3.79
-		-		3	9	7							3.55
2	2	2	2	8	3	10	3.68	950/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.20
-	-	_	_		_	_							
2	-			10	-	•		,					3.41
2		0		3	12	-							4.00
	-	1		7	6			/ -					3.89
2	1	1	4	7	7	7	3.58	708/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.58
	0	0	-	0	0	0		****	0 00	4 1 2	4 0 0	2 0 7	* * * *
	-	-	T	0	0	0		,					****
	-	_	-		-	ů.		, -					
	-	_	-	-	Ũ	•		,					* * * *
	-	_	-		ů.			,					* * * *
28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 5 7 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 2	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	NR         NA         1           0         0         2           0         0         1           1         0         2           2         14         2           2         18         0           2         2         0         2           2         2         0         2           2         2         0         2           2         2         0         0           3         0         0         3           3         2         2         2           2         2         0         0           3         0         0         3           2         2         2         2           2         0         2         3           2         2         0         1           2         0         1         2           2         0         1         2           1         1         1         1           28         0         1         2	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean           0         0         2         1         9         13         4         3.55         1495/1674         3.55           0         0         1         5         10         6         7         3.45         1523/1674         3.53           1         0         2         4         14         7         1         3.04         1360/1423         3.03           2         14         2         1         7         2         1         2.92         1573/1609         3.07           2         6         0         1         7         11         2         3.67         1121/1585         3.63           2         18         0         3         2         3         1         3.22         1398/1535         3.15           2         0         2         2         6         10         7         3.67         1377/1651         3.67           3         0         0         2         7         17         4.58         1166/1585         4.29           3         0	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean         Mean           0         0         2         1         9         13         4         3.55         1495/1674         3.55         3.87           0         0         1         5         10         6         7         3.45         1523/1674         3.53         3.76           1         0         2         4         14         7         1         3.04         1360/1423         3.03         3.53           2         14         2         1         7         2         1.2.92         1573/1609         3.07         3.67           2         6         0         1         7         11         2         3.67         1321/1585         3.63         3.69           d         2         18         0         3         2         3         1         3.22         1398/1535         3.15         3.77           2         0         2         6         10         7         3.67         13.67         3.82           3         0         0         2         7         17 <td>NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean</td> <td><math display="block">\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc</math></td>	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	7	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	1						

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	7	6	12		1139/1674		3.87		4.07	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	13	5		1382/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	8	8	5		1293/1423		3.53	4.27	4.16	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	7	7	4		1334/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	7	6	9	4.09	708/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2 2	12	1 3	0 2	3 7	6	3		1140/1535		3.77	4.08	3.89	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	∠ 3	0 2	3	2 0	0	6 0	7 22		1450/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.48 5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3 8	2	1	1	9	5	22	5.00	1/1673 1444/1656	4.95 3.35	4.89 3.66	4.69 4.07	4.67 3.96	5.00 3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	T	T	T	9	5	2	3.33	1444/1050	3.35	5.00	4.07	3.90	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	7	5	7	3.61	1460/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	9	3	9	3.83	1520/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	7	8	5	3.61	1371/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	1284/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	3	1	3	4	1	2.92	1264/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	б	8	5	3 40	1221/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	7	7	7		1274/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	4	7	7	4		1361/1511		3.57	4.27	4.00	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	2	4	7			712/ 994			3.94	3.73	
I WELC PROTAT COUNTINGED PROCEDURE	5	-	0	-	-			5.57	,22, ,,	5.55	5.10	5.51	5.75	5.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
<ol><li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li></ol>	25	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work	0.5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0 00		0 11	0 11	2 2 2	2 20	* * * *
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0 0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25		0	2	0	0	0		****/ 77	2.33 ****	2.33 ****	3.93	3.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25 26	0 0	1 0	0 0	0 1	0 0	1 0		****/ 48 ****/ 49	****	****	4.12 4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	Ţ	0	0	3.00	49			4.2/	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

ourse-Section: CHEM 101 0207	University of Maryland	Page 279
itle PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
nstructor: PAPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
nrollment: 30		
uestionnaires: 27	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
	? 1										

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	з 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
l														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	7	б	12	1 0 9	1139/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	13	5		1382/1674	3.53	3.76	4.27	4.07	4.08 3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	8	8	5		1293/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	7	7	4		1334/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	7	6	9	4.09	708/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	0	3	б	3	3.77	1140/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	7	б	7	3.48	1450/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1297/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	13		171/1586		4.17	4.43	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	6	9		1142/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	850/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13 12	3	0 1	1 0	0	3 5	10 6	4.57 4.25	612/1575 489/1380	3.49 3.40	3.70 3.62	4.27 3.94	4.17	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	T	0	0	c	0	4.25	489/1380	3.40	3.02	3.94	3.78	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	б	8	5	3.40	1221/1520	3.14		4.01	3.76	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	1274/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	4	7	7	4		1361/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	2	4	7	7	3.57	712/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * * * * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25 25	0 1	1 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 1		****/ 259 ****/ 233	3.00 ****	4.19 4.02	4.33	4.19 4.00	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	T	0	0	0	0	T	5.00	~~~/ 233		4.02	4.20	4.00	
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 76		2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced		-					-							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26 26	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 35 ****/ 21	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.⊥/	4.34	3.88	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0207	University of Maryland	Page 280
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 30		
Questionnaires: 27	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	ł	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	б	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	5	3	3.25	1583/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	8	2	3.30	1568/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	б	2	2.95	1374/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1587/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	5	3	3	5	3.50	1223/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1509/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	1	6	6	3.45	1463/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	10	3	0	3.07	1531/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	4	2	9	3.65	1445/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	5	5	6	3.65	1540/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	8	4	б	0	2.70	1553/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	4	8	2	1	2.50	1547/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	б	3	1	4	4	1	2.92	1259/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	1	Б	2	1	2 25	1487/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	5	2	1		1403/1515		3.53	4.24	3.97	3.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	5	2	7	2		1447/1511	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.00	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	5	1	5	, 2	ے 4	3.00	881/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.73	3.00
1. Nete spectal countques successful	0	2	J	1	5	5	т	5.00	001/ JJI	5.55	5.10	5.54	5.75	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L L	Expected	d Grades	Reasons	asons Type			Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	б	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	14					
				?	1							

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	5	3	3.25	1583/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	8	2	3.30	1568/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	б	2	2.95	1374/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1587/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	5	3	3	5	3.50	1223/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1509/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	1	6	б	3.45	1463/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	7	4	2	3.27	1470/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	0	5	10	4 11	1243/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	5	11		1392/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	3	5	4		1487/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	3	2	3	5		1472/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	7	0	3	3	6		1212/1380		3.62	3.94		2.99
······································									,,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	4	5	3	1	2.35	1487/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	6	8	1	3.15	1403/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	5	2	7	2	2.90	1447/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	5	1	5	3	4	3.00	881/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Туре			Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	б	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	14					
				?	1							

Ouestions	NTD	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	3	5		ructor Rank	Course	-			Sect
Quescions		INA				4		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	б	7	3.78	1393/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	Ő	0	1	8	7	7		1298/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	Ő	2	3	6	7	5		1290/1423		3.53	4.27	4.16	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	6	3	5		1399/1609	3.07	3.67		4.05	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	9	5	3.89	916/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	836/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	7	8		1338/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	22		635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	6	5	3		1466/1656		3.66	4.07	3.96	
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	б	5	11	4.09	1260/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	4	14	4.30	1374/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	8	3	8	3.57	1385/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	8	7	3.78	1274/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	3	7	7	3.89	803/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	6	8	б	3.61	1129/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	5	4		4.39	768/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	6	4	9		1253/1511		3.57	4.27	4.00	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	4	1	2	4	9	3.65	680/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.65
Laboratory		-												
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made creat	21	-	0	0	0	Ŧ	0	1.00	/ 5/	5.50	5.05	1.11	5.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	2.33		3.93	3.42	* * * *
/									,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section: CHEM 101 020	)9	University c	of Maryland		Page 283
Title PRIN OF CHEM	ISTRY I	Baltimore	County	J	AN 21, 2006
Instructor: PAPENMEIER, I	DOU (Instr. A)	Fall	2005	J	ob IRBR3029
Enrollment: 29					
Questionnaires: 23	Studen	t Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	8							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	2							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	14					
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0209 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B) Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 23

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Ouestions	ND	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect Mean
Questions						т 								
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	б	7	3.78	1393/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	7	7	3.87	1298/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	б	7	5	3.43	1290/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	б	3	5	3.63	1399/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	9	5	3.89	916/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	836/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	7	8	3.74	1338/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	805/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	618/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	689/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	5	9		1079/1582	3.59		4.26	4.17	3.83
<ol><li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li></ol>	3	0	1	0	4	8	7		1138/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	472/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	б	8	6	3.61	1129/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	5	4	14	4.39	768/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	б	4	9	3.70	1253/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	4	1	2	4	9	3.65	680/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0209	University of Maryland	Page 284
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 29		
Questionnaires: 23	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	8							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	2							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	14					
				?	0							

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	10	33	38	4.25	954/1674	4.25	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	10	30	46	4.44	673/1674		3.76	4.23	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	Ō	5	31	46	4.46	636/1423	4.46	3.53	4.27	4.16	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	68	0	0	1	7	8		****/1609	****	3.67	4.22	4.05	* * * *
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	0	10	24	40	4.36	452/1585	4.36	3.69	3.96	3.88	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	65	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	****/1535	* * * *	3.77	4.08	3.89	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	б	20	56	4.55	471/1651	4.55	3.82	4.18	4.10	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	8	74	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	0	6	34	31	4.31	655/1656	4.31	3.66	4.07	3.96	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	19	61	4.70	618/1586	4.70	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	9	73	4.87	664/1585	4.87	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	24	55	4.62	496/1582	4.62	3.81	4.26	4.17	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	1	8	21	49	4.49	704/1575	4.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	42	5	5	8	б	16	3.58	1009/1380	3.58	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	61	0	4	2	2	11	6		1161/1520		3.40	4.01	3.76	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	62	0	2	1	5	9	7		1209/1515	3.75	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	62 62	0 13	3 2	4 1	5 3	7 4	5 1		1361/1511 ****/ 994	3.29 ****	3.57 3.46	4.27 3.94	4.00 3.73	3.29 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	02	13	2	T	2	7	Ŧ	3.09	/ / //		5.40	3.94	5.75	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	83	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 278	* * * *	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * * * * * *
<ol> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> </ol>	83 83	0 0	0 0	0 1	1 1	1 1	1 0		****/ 260 ****/ 259	****	4.41 4.19	4.46 4.33	4.41 4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 233	****	4.19	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for fub reports creatly specified	05	Ū	0	0	2	-	0	5.55	, 255		1.02	1.20	1.00	
Seminar	~ .				-									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	84	1	0 0	0 1	1 0	0 0	0		****/ 103	**** ****	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	84 84	1 1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 101 ****/ 95	****	4.50 4.50	4.48 4.31	4.18 3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.50 3.78	4.31	3.99 4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	84	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
		_	-	_	-	-	-		,					
Field Work		_	_	_	_	-	-							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	84	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	84	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * * * * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	85	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53 ****/ 48	****	* * * * * * * *	4.45	4.34	****
<ol> <li>To what degree could you discuss your evaluations</li> <li>Did conferences help you carry out field activities</li> </ol>	85 85	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 48 ****/ 49	****	****	4.12 4.27	4.00 4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	00	0	0	0	0	T	0	4.00				4.2/	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	84	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	84	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	84	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	84 84	1 1	0 0	0	1 1	0 0	0	3.00	****/ 35 ****/ 31	* * * * * * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92 3.88	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	04	T	U	U	T	U	U	5.00	31		3.17	4.34	3.00	

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 0101
Title	PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
Instructor:	SMITH, PAUL J.
Enrollment:	226
Questionnaires:	86

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA	Α	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	22	1.00-1.99	0	В	33						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	11	С	25	General	1	Under-grad	86	Non-major	84
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	74	_			
				?	2						

Questions			Fre 1	-	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins <sup>:</sup> Mean	tructor Rank	Course	-	UMBC Mean		
		NA 												
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	5	6	4	3.35	1558/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	7	3	2	2.75	1646/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	2	2	3	3	2.93	1381/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	2	5	4	3.40	1484/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	865/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	1328/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	б	5	б		1403/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	4	7	1	2	2.81	1590/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	2	4	5	5	3 25	1522/1586	3.52	4 17	4.43	4.37	3.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	0	5	7	5		1549/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	5	2	6	3		1517/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	1	3	6	2		1539/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	0	3	1	2		845/1380			3.94	3.78	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	0	4	3	2		1453/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	9	1	4	0	1		1500/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	8	1	2	3	1		1491/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.20
4. Were special techniques successful	6	11	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	214/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	Ő	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	241/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	168/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	246/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	.,	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	
Self Paced	~~	0	~	0	1	~	0	2 0 0		ار بار بار بار	ار بار بار بار	4 4 4	4 20	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	T	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	***	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *

Credits H	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Ouestions			Fre 1	-	ncies		-		tructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	3	5	6	4	3.35	1558/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	7	3			1646/1674		3.76	4.23	4.16	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	2	2	3	3	2.93	1381/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	2	5	4	3.40	1484/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	865/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	б	4	1	3.42	1328/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	5	6		1403/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	3	7	2	1	3.08	1530/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.94
T a shows														
Lecture	0	0	1	2	F	0	4	2 2 2	1524/1586	2 5 2	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.24
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>	87	0	1 1	3 2	2	0	4		1524/1586	3.52 3.62	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.24 3.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2 6	2 4	2	2		1504/1582		4.30 3.81	4.89	4.80	2.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	4	∠ 3			1511/1575		3.70		4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7		0	0	-	1	1		****/1380				3.78	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	'	12	0	0	0	T	T	4.50	/1380	2.70	3.02	5.94	3.70	5.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	б	0	6	0	4	3	2	2.67	1453/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	9	1	4	0	1	1.87	1500/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	б	0	8	1	2	3	1	2.20	1491/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.20
4. Were special techniques successful	б	11	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory	-	-	_	_	-		_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	214/ 265	3.71		4.23	3.97	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	241/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	168/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	246/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	210/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.42
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Questions		NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	s 	5	Ins† Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	5	2	5	1	2.56	1663/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	2.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	3	б	1	2.78	1644/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	4	3	2	3	2.87	1391/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	2	3	5	2	2.82	1586/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	1181/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	5	6	1	3.13	1423/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	3	1	5	3		1597/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	9	2	0	2.79	1595/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	3	6	5		1480/1586		4.17	4.43	4.37	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	4	5	4		1564/1585		4.30	4.69	4.60	3.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	7	4			1546/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3 2	5	5	0		1545/1575		3.70	4.27	4.17	2.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	4	2	0	1	0	1.71	1371/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	1.76
Discussion								~						
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	0	4	2	0		1481/1520		3.40	4.01	3.76	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	4	3	1	1	0		1499/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10 10	0 6	5 0	1 0	0 2	1 0	1		1495/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00 3.73	2.00 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	TO	0	0	0	Z	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.40	3.94	3./3	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	6	0	4	7	1	2.83	262/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	2.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	258/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.06
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	6		4.39	163/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.41	4.39
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	220/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.19	3.72
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	3	3	6	2	4	3.06	220/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.06
Seminar		_		-		_	_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * * * * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	,	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	,	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15 15	0 1	1 0	0 0	1 1	0 1	1 0	3.00	, 22	****	3.78 3.83	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	T	0	0	T	T	0	3.50	×××/ 9/		3.83	4.14	3.09	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	,	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 0301	University of Maryland	Page 288
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	20		
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits E	Earned	ed Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons			Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	б	С	б	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Questions		NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins† Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	5	2	5	1	2.56	1663/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	2.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	3	б	1	2.78	1644/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	4	3	2	3	2.87	1391/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	2	3	5	2		1586/1609		3.67	4.22	4.05	2.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	3	3	5		1181/1585		3.69	3.96	3.88	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	5	6	1		1423/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	3	1	5	3		1597/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	6	2	0	2.90	1581/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	3	2	3	4		1487/1586		4.17	4.43	4.37	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3	5	2		1532/1585		4.30	4.69	4.60	3.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	2	5	2	0		1560/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	1	3	3	0		1550/1575		3.70	4.27	4.17	2.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1368/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	1.76
Discussion	-	_		_			_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	0	4	2	0		1481/1520		3.40	4.01	3.76	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	4	3	1	1	0		1499/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	1 0	0	1	1		1495/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.00 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.40	3.94	3.73	~ ~ ^ ~
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	б	0	4	7	1	2.83	262/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	2.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	258/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.06
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	6		4.39	163/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.41	4.39
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	220/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.19	3.72
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	3	3	б	2	4	3.06	220/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.06
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	,	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	,	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0 1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	Ţ	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	,	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 0301	University of Maryland	Page 289
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Keating, Loryn (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	20		
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	б	С	б	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	0	8	4	1	3.00	1628/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	6	1	3.31	1565/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	5	1	0	2.67	1405/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1360/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1066/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	840/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	1	3	б	3.53	1430/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	1072/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	7	2	0	2.77	1598/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	3.50	1480/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1561/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	б	5	4	1	3.00	1504/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	5	2	2	2.69	1537/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	1366/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	1.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	2	0	1	2.25	1496/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1470/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	0	1	1	2.38	1485/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.38
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	229/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	204/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	196/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.21
<ol><li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li></ol>	3	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	163/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	206/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Self Paced													0.04	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	б	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				-	ncies	3			ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	0	8	4	1	3.00	1628/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	6	1	3.31	1565/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	5	1	0	2.67	1405/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1360/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1066/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	840/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	1	3	б	3.53	1430/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	1072/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	б	0	3.45	1399/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1460/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1532/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	4	2	2		1480/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1528/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1359/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	1.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	2	0	1		1496/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.25
<ol><li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li></ol>	8	0	2	3	1	1	1		1470/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	0	1	1		1485/1511		3.57	4.27	4.00	2.38
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	229/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	204/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	196/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.21
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	163/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	206/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Self Paced							-						0.04	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	5	6	1	1	2.41	1667/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	2.41
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	7	2	3	0		1669/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.18
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	8	3	1	1	0		1423/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	1.62
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	6	2	4	1		1583/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.86
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	4	4	3	0	2.40	1553/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	2.40
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	4	3	1	2.86	1478/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.86
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	5	4	2	0	2.19	1632/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.19
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	987/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.73
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	5	4	2	0	2.46	1622/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.56
-	Lecture	2	•	0	-	-	~	0	2 0 7	1504/1506	2 50	4 1 1	4 4 2	4 25	0 85
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	Ţ	5	6	0		1534/1586			4.43	4.37	2.75
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2 4	5	4	3		1547/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.36
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	-	2 7	-	5	3	0		1559/1582	3.23		4.26	4.17	2.46
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0 6		4	0	3			1567/1575	3.05		4.27	4.17	1.80
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	3	0	2	T	1	2.57	1314/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.57
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	1442/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.71
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	0	1	0	1.71	1506/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.71
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1482/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.43
4.	Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
_	Laboratory	_	-	_	_	_	_	_							
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	229/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.50
	Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	4	3	2	1	3.00	259/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.00
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	235/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.90
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	4	0	4	3.60	228/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.60
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	3	2	4	0	2.90	224/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	2.90
	Seminar														
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	1	Other	14					
				?	2							

Questiens					-	ncies		_		tructor	Course	-			
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	5	б	1	1	2.41	1667/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	2.41
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	7	2	3	0		1669/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.18
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	8	3	1	1	0		1423/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	1.62
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	6	2	4	1	2.86	1583/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.86
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	4	4	3	0	2.40	1553/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	2.40
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	4	3	1	2.86	1478/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.86
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	5	4	2	0	2.19	1632/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.19
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	987/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.73
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	5	0	1	2.67	1610/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.56
-	Lecture	1.0	0	-	0		0	0	0 40	1	2 50	4 1 1	4 4 2	4 0 17	0 85
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	2	4	0	0		1576/1586		4.17		4.37	2.75
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	3	3	0		1571/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.36
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	3	3	0	0		1574/1582	3.23		4.26	4.17	2.46
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	0	1			1572/1575		3.70		4.17	1.80
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	0	T	1	0	3.50	****/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.57
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	1442/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.71
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	0	1	0		1506/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.71
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1482/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.43
	Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
	Laboratory														
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	229/ 265	3.71		4.23	3.97	3.50
	Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	4	3	2	1		259/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.00
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	/	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.90
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	4	0	4	3.60	228/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.60
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	3	2	4	0	2.90	224/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	2.90
	Seminar														
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 95	* * * *		4.31		* * * *
										,					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	14				
				?	2						

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	8	5	3.68	1439/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	1111/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	б	3	5	3.63	1237/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	1	3	3	б	3.50	1452/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	7	б	4.00	769/1585		3.69	3.96	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	797/1535		3.77	4.08	3.89	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	3	8		1310/1651		3.82	4.18	4.10	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	0	2			1203/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1455/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	4	6		1412/1586		4.17	4.43	4.37	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	4	6	5		1544/1585		4.30	4.69	4.60	3.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	8	3	6		1290/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	6	5		1336/1575		3.70	4.27	4.17	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1196/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	777/1520		3.40	4.01	3.76	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	944/1515		3.53	4.24	3.97	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	0	6		1249/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	614/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	141/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	142/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	б	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	145/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.41	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	148/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.19	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	б	0	0	1	2	4	б	4.15	132/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	4.15
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * * * * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2			* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	, -	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * * * * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	~ ~ * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 0601	University of Maryland	Page 294
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	23		
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins† Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	8	5	3.68	1439/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	1111/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1237/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	1	3	3	б	3.50	1452/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	7	б	4.00	769/1585		3.69	3.96	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	797/1535		3.77	4.08	3.89	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	3	8		1310/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	0	2			1203/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1124/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.61
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	7	0	0	0	3	2	7		1074/1586		4.17	4.43	4.37	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	3	3	5		1502/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	3			1070/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	3	5		1138/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	540/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	777/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	944/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	0	6		1249/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	614/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	141/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	142/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	145/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.41	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	148/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	132/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	4.15
Seminar			_	_		_	-							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	* * * * * * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * * * * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17 17	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	2 2	5.00	****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	3.78 3.83	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Τ/	0	0	0	0	U	2	5.00	~~~/ 9/	~ ~ ~ ~	3.83	4.14	3.69	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		, .	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	* * * * * * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * * * * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	2	5.00	****/ 48 ****/ 49	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	~ ~ ~ ^	~ ~ ~ ~	4.27	4.30	~ ~ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * * * * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 0601	University of Maryland	Page 295
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Vokkaliga, Smit (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	23		
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	5	7	5	1	3 00	1628/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	4	1		1623/1674		3.76	4.23	4.16	2.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	4	3	1		1395/1423		3.53	4.27	4.16	2.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	5	2	3		1525/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	4	5	2		1411/1585		3.69	3.96	3.88	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1374/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	4	б	3.61	1398/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	742/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	12	1	2	3.06	1533/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	8	1	5	3.21	1526/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	9	1	4	3.11	1573/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	7	1	4	2.95	1519/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	5	3	3		1533/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	* * * *
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1480/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	3	0	1	2.57	1473/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	252/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	4	6	3	1	2.71	270/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	2.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	229/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	1	3	3	б	3.35	242/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.35
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	215/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1 0	0	4.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 31	~ ~ ~ *	3.17	4.34	3.88	~ ~ ~ ~

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 0701	University of Maryland	Page 296
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	20		
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	13					
				?	1							

Questions		NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins† Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	7	5	1		1628/1674		3.87		4.07	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	4	1		1623/1674		3.76	4.23	4.16	2.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	4	3	1		1395/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	5	2	3		1525/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3 4	3 1	1 1	4 6	5			1411/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1	4	1	⊥ 3	6 4	5 4	1 6		1374/1535 1398/1651	3.53 3.32	3.77 3.82	4.08 4.18	3.89 4.10	3.29 3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	-		4.89	742/1673		3.82 4.89	4.10	4.10	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	7	3	0		1500/1656			4.07	3.96	
5. now would you grade the overall cedening effectiveness	0	0	Ū	-	,	5	0	5.10	1900, 1090	5.21	5.00	1.07	5.50	5.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	6	0	2	3.22	1525/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	1	4	2	1		1572/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	4	2	0		1533/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	2.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1545/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	2	1	1	3 00	1353/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	2	1	0		1480/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	3	0	1		1473/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	1	1	0	1		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory	-	_	_	_		_	_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	252/ 265		4.13	4.23	3.97	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	4	6	3	1	2.71	270/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	2.71
<ol> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> </ol>	2 2	1 0	0 4	3 1	2 3	4 3	7 6	3.94 3.35	229/ 260 242/ 259	4.20 3.92	4.41 4.19	4.46 4.33	4.41 4.19	3.94 3.35
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2 3	0	4 3	1	3	5		3.35	242/259		4.19	4.33		3.35
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearly specified	3	0	5	Т	2	0	2	3.31	213/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced						-								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * * * * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0 0	0	0 0	0 0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 52 ****/ 50	****	3.13 ****	4.26	3.91	****
<ol> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> </ol>	18 18	0	0 0	0	0	1	0 0	4.00	,	****	3.71	4.44 4.36	4.39 3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	3.17		3.92	****
5. Mere chere enough proceers for all the students	TO	U	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	/ 51		5.11	1.54	5.00	

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 0701	University of Maryland	Page 297
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Mendez, Miguel (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	20		
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	13					
				?	1							

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1155/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	8	3.63	1436/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	5	2	1	7	3.35	1311/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.35
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		4	1	2	4	2	б	3.67	1377/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	1	5	7	3.88	926/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	1092/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	2	2	8	3.47	1454/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18		424/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	3	2	7	0	3.15	1510/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	4	4	8	3.89	1376/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	3	2	10	4.06	1463/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	4			1228/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3			1090/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	3	1	0	3	3.43	1082/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	1	4		1068/1520		3.40	4.01	3.76	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	4	0	3		1414/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	3	1	3		1405/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	591/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	б	2	9	4.00	178/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	8	2	7	3.78	221/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	3		4.22		4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	142/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.19	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	7	0	5	1	5	2.83	228/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	2.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	3	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00		* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	1	0		,	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * * * * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1 0	0 1	0 2	1 0	1 0	0	3.50	****/ 99 ****/ 97	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	T	2	0	U	0	1.67	****/ 97	~ ~ ~ ^	3.83	4.14	3.69	~ ~ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced		-					-							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	~ ~ * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 0801	University of Maryland	Page 298
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	23		
Questionnaires	19	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	0						

			Fre	equei	ncies	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1155/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	8		1436/1674		3.76	4.23	4.16	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	5	2	1	7		1311/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	4	2	б		1377/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		2	0	4	1	5	7	3.88	926/1585		3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	1092/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	2	2	8		1454/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	424/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	б	5	4.45	451/1656			4.07	3.96	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1217/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	1322/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	3	7		956/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	3	6		1050/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	3	1	0	2	3.17	1190/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1068/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	1414/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1405/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	591/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	б	2	9	4.00	178/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	8	2	7	3.78	221/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	195/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	142/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	7	0	5	1	5	2.83	228/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	2.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 0801	University of Maryland	Page 299
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Zhang, Hailang (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	23		
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Questions		NA	Fre 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins† Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	10	7	0	3.21	1592/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	10	6	1	3.32	1565/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1284/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	9	4	2	3.35	1495/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	б	6	3	3.50	1223/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	5	7	1	3.40	1332/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	6	1		1544/1651		3.82	4.18	4.10	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3			832/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	5	6	3	3.47	1390/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	11	1	3.58	1466/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	8	6	3	3.47	1554/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	12	0		1399/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	4	9	2		1442/1575		3.70	4.27	4.17	3.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	5	2	3	0	2.64	1307/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	5	6	0	3.55	1153/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.55
<ol><li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li></ol>	9	0	2	2	5	1	1		1463/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	5	2	1		1447/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.91
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	212/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.76
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	6	4	б	3.88	210/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	171/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	3	7		3.76	218/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.19	3.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	8	6	2	3.53	207/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.53
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced		_	_		_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0 0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	* * * * * * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	U	U	U	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	~ ~ ^ ×	3.17	4.34	3.88	~ ~ ~ ~

Course-Section:	: CHEM 102L 0901	University of Maryland	Page 300
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	22		
Questionnaires	20	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Туре			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	В	7							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	14					
				?	0							

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	10	7	0	3.21	1592/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	Ő	0	2	10	6	1		1565/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	2	4	3	2		1284/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	9	4	2		1495/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	6	6	3		1223/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	5	7	1		1332/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	б	1		1544/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	15		832/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	7	5			1444/1656	3.24		4.07	3.96	3.40
Tankun														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	6	7	0	2 00	1539/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.29
2. Did the instructor's fectures well prepared	3	0	3 1	1	8	5	0		1563/1585	3.52 3.62	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	⊥ 4	o 4	5	0		1519/1582	3.02	4.30 3.81	4.89	4.80	3.23
	3	0	2	4 3	4 6	4	2			3.05	3.70	4.20	4.17	3.16
<ol> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</li> </ol>	3	8	2 1	4	1	4	0		1480/1575 1304/1380			4.27 3.94		2.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	T	4	T	3	0	2.07	1304/1380	2.70	3.02	3.94	3.78	2.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	5	б	0	3.55	1153/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	5	1	1	2.73	1463/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	1447/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.91
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	212/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.76
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	Ő	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	210/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	171/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	3	7	5	3.76	218/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	8	6	2	3.53	207/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.53
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 97	* * * *		4.14	3.69	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made creat	10	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	/ )/		5.05	1.11	5.05	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	$17^{1}$	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 31	* * * *		4.34	3.88	* * * *
s. Here ended shough proceeds for all the students	± '	-	0	0	U	-	-	1.50	, 51		5.17	1.51	5.00	

Course-Section:	: CHEM 102L 0901	University of Maryland	Page 301
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Vokkaliga, Smit (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	22		
Questionnaires	20	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Questions		NA	Fre 1	equei 2	ncie: 3	з 4	5	Ins† Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
l														
General 1. Did you qain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4 08	1131/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	2		1319/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	2	1	3		1342/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	2		1278/1609	3.37		4.22	4.05	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	1	4		1164/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	0	5	1		1229/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	3		1345/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1040/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	1	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	2	5		1391/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	4	3		1539/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	5	1		1486/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	5	2		1414/1575		3.70		4.17	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1351/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	0		1481/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	0	0	1	0		1508/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	0	1			1507/1511		3.57		4.00	1.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	93/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	86/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	62/ 259		4.19		4.19	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	188/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.75
Seminar		_		-		_	_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0 0	0	0	1 0	0	0		****/ 95	* * * * * * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 1001	University of Maryland	Page 302
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	17		
Questionnaires:	12	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	3						

			Fre	-	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1131/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	б	2	3.83	1319/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1342/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1278/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1164/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	0	5	1	3.63	1229/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4			1345/1651		3.82	4.18	4.10	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	1			1040/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	1074/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1158/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	935/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3		4.42				4.27	4.17	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	б	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1324/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1481/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1508/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	0	1			1507/1511		3.57		4.00	1.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	93/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	86/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	62/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	188/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 1001	University of Maryland	Page 303
Title	INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Ganuly, Soumya (Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	17		
Questionnaires:	12	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons					Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other						
				?	3							

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				-	ncie		F		tructor	Course	-			Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	7	19	18	15	3.65	1454/1674	3.65	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	9	15	21	15	3.61	1446/1674	3.61	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	8	20	20	7		1330/1423	3.27	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	24	4	5	11	9	7		1513/1609	3.28	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	4	3	11	22	9		1169/1585		3.69	3.96	3.88	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	3	3	8	7	4		1390/1535		3.77	4.08	3.89	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	1	6	12	21	16		1289/1651	3.80	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	8	50		868/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	2	8	19	13	6	3.27	1466/1656	3.27	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	5	16	35	4.41	1004/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	13	44	4.66	1083/1585	4.66	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	5	22	17	11		1413/1582		3.81	4.26	4.17	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	12	18	24		1153/1575	3.98	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	5	8	16	26	4.09	630/1380	4.09	3.62	3.94	3.78	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	2	3	5	5	4	3.32	1261/1520	3.32	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	2	2	б	4	5	3.42	1333/1515	3.42	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	1	1	5	8	4		1257/1511	3.68	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	44	4	1	1	6	1	5	3.57	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	3.73	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	* * * *	4.13	4.23	3.97	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	* * * *	4.08	4.19	3.97	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 260	* * * *	4.41	4.46	4.41	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 259	* * * *	4.19	4.33	4.19	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.00	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.33	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.18	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.99	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.10	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.69	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	3.32	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.42	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.34	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	,	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.00	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.87	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.91	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	4.39	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.92	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	3.88	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 123 0101
Title	GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM
Instructor:	GEIRASCH, TIFFA
Enrollment:	123
Questionnaires:	62

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	С	19	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	55				
				?	3						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	950/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1500/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1146/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	874/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	850/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	983/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	363/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1515		3.40	4.01 4.24	4.09	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9 9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1511		3.53	4.24	4.32	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	U	T	5.00	****/1511	3.07	3.57	4.2/	4.34	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	170/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.67

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

	Frequen					3		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	б	2	4.11	950/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	б	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1500/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	б	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1431/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1442/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	2	2		1472/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	Ō	1	0	0		****/1515		3.53	4.24	4.32	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1511		3.57	4.27	4.34	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.50	93/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	170/ 278	4.20	4.08	4.19	4.20	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/233		4.02	4.20	4.18	4.67
5. Were requirements for fab reports creatly specified	т	U	U	0	U	2	т	1.07	55/ 255	ч. 59	1.02	1.20	1.10	1.07

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad 1	10	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to b	be sigr	nificant	
				I	0	Other					
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Instructor: Turner, Kevin (Instr. C) Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 10

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	б	2	4.11	950/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1500/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	849/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	õ	0	0	0	3	2		1309/1585		4.30	4.69	4.66	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	õ	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582		3.81	4.26	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	1		1138/1575		3.70	4.27	4.25	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/1380		3.62	3.94	4.01	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/1520		3.40	4.01	4.09	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1515		3.53	4.24	4.32	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	170/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.67

Credits E	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				-	ncies				ructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	3	б	4	3.86	1353/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1394/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	3	3.36	1311/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	б	б	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1339/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	858/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	853/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	1	4		3.64	1355/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	6		1309/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	303/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	$12 \\ 12$	0	0	0	1	1 1	1		****/1515	2.96	3.40	4.01 4.24	4.09	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	$12 \\ 12$	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1511		3.53	4.24	4.34	* * * *
4. Were special techniques successful	$12 \\ 12$	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	Ŧ	0	0	5.00	/ ))1		5.40	5.94	5.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	172/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	137/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	171/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	С	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	1						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	cies				ructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	3	б	4	3.86	1353/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1394/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	3	3.36	1311/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	б	б	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	794/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.96
Lecture	1.0	0	~	0	-	~	-	4 0 0	1000/1506	4 41	4 1 1	4 4 2	4 40	4 1 1
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	Ţ	2	1		1300/1586		4.17	4.43	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	2	1		1524/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	2	1		1406/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	Ţ	Ţ	0	2	1		1458/1575		3.70	4.27	4.25	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	* * * *
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory		-	-	_	_	_	_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	172/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	137/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	2	б	4.20	171/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	С	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	1						

				-	ncies	5			ructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	3	б	4	3.86	1353/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1394/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	3	3.36	1311/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	б	б	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	900/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4 00	1300/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	2	1		1546/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	2	1		1406/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	2	1		1458/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27		3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	0	0	1	0		****/1380		3.62	3.94	4.01	
5. Dia additivitsuar cecinitques chilance your anderscanding	2	1	0	0	0	-	0	1.00	/1500	5.90	5.02	5.91	1.01	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	* * * *
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	З	4.10	172/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	137/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	2	±0 6	4.20	171/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60
5. Mere requirements for fub reports crearly specifica	1	0	5	5	-	2	,	1.00	01, 200	1.55	1.02	1.20	1.10	1.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	С	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	1						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1196/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1043/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1016/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1377/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1084/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1258/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	б	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1177/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	689/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	1		1244/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	1		1309/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	866/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	2 25	1284/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	2.96	3.40	4.01 4.24	4.09	3.25 4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2		2		1050/1511	3.67	3.55	4.24	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	****
1. Mere special commiques successiai	5	5	-	0	0	0	0	1.00	/ 551		5.10	5.91	5.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	155/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	72/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	159/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	184/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.80

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L L	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies	5			ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1196/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1043/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1016/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1377/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1084/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	б	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1258/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1200/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	1300/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	0		1472/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1		1138/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/1380		3.62	3.94		3.80
5. Dia additivitsuar econiciques enhance your anderscanding	5	-	-	0	0	0	0	1.00	/1500	5.90	5.02	5.91	1.01	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1284/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1050/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	155/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.20
	2	0	0	0	0	4	⊥ 3	4.20	72/ 278	4.20	4.13	4.23	4.20	4.20
<ol> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> </ol>	2	0	0	0	0	2 0	5	4.80 5.00	1/ 260	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.80 5.00
-		1	0	-	0	-	Э 1		159/259	4.73	4.41	4.40	4.49	5.00 4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2 2	1	0	0	1	3	⊥ 2	4.25 3.80	184/233	4.47	4.19	4.33		
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	U	U	Т	Т	Т	2	3.80	104/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.80

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1196/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1043/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1016/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1377/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1084/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1258/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	б	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1330/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	0		1472/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	Ő	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	2 25	1284/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	2.96	3.40	4.01 4.24	4.09	3.25 4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2		2		1050/1511	3.67	3.55	4.24	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	****
1. Weie Special coomiques Successial	5	5	-	0	0	Ū	0	1.00	, ,, ,,		5.10	5.51	5.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	155/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	72/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	159/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	184/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.80

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L L	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1611/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1499/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1389/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	2.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	* * * *
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1525/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1009/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	0	4	0	0	2.33	1631/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	723/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	917/1585		4.30	4.69	4.66	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	1	1		1448/1582		3.81	4.26	4.26	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	3	1		1445/1575		3.70	4.27	4.25	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	4	1	1	2	3.13	1202/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	F	0	1	0	1	1	0	2 67	1453/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	0		1361/1515		3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	0		1351/1511		3.55	4.24	4.34	
5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	T	0	3.33	1331/1311	5.07	3.57	4.2/	4.34	5.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	146/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	211/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	190/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	б	4.75	62/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1611/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1499/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1389/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	2.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	* * * *
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1525/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1009/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1297/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	2		1354/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	850/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27		4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2 67	1453/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	0		1361/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	0		1351/1511	3.67	3.55	4.27		3.33
5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	J	0	0	0	2	Ŧ	0	5.55	1331/1311	5.07	5.57	1.2/	т. Эт	5.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	З	4.25	146/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	211/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	190/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	62/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50
5. Here requirements for tas reports creatly specified	0	0	5	5	5	-	-	1.50	.2/ 255	1.55	1.02	1.20	1.10	1.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1611/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1499/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1389/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	2.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	* * * *
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1525/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1009/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	2		1354/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	1		1129/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	Ō	1	1	4.50	692/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27		4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1453/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1361/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1351/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	З	4.25	146/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	211/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	190/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	62/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	0	0	0	0	0	T	т	1.50	,2/ 200	1.59	1.02	1.20	1.10	1.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	13	20	4.51	594/1674	4.51	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1 J	23	4.57	495/1674	4.57	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	a	24	4.57	493/1423	4.57	3.53	4.27	4.21	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	892/1609	4.23	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	11	γ Q	11	3.88	936/1585	3.88	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	319/1535	4.57	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	1	0	2	4	26	4.64	361/1651	4.64	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	-	33	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	14	14	4.37	575/1656	4.37	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.37
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	-	1	ТŢ	ТТ	1.57	37371030	ч.57	5.00	1.07	1.07	1.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	28	4.76	496/1586	4.76	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	11	20	4.48	661/1582	4.48	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	8	24	4.59	601/1575	4.59	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	2	1	9	2	3	3.18	1187/1380	3.18	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	912/1520	3.92	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	3	3	б	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	2	1	1	1	7	3.83	1177/1511	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	24	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	* * * *	4.13	4.23	4.26	* * * *

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	26
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 Title ADVANCED LAB I Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A) Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	-	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1139/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3		1312/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1155/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1035/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	б	4.08	722/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	870/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1317/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1246/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1177/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.20
Lecture	-	•	0	0	2	-		4 00	1000/1500	2 66	4 1 1	4 4 2	4 40	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	4		1260/1586		4.17		4.42	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	8		1158/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0 0	0 1	1 3	3	4	4		1208/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	-	_	-	3	0	5		1398/1575		3.70	4.27	4.25	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	3	2	T	3.43	1082/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	3		1024/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	865/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 994		3.46		3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	178/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	122/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	210/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	208/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	201/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 101				4.30	* * * *
2. was the instructor available for individual attention		-	0	0	0	-	0	1.00	/ 101		1.50	1.10	1.50	

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA	L L	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

				-	ncies		-		ructor	Course	-			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1139/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3		1312/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	1	2		1155/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1035/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	722/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	870/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1317/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1246/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	1486/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	1	1		1415/1586		4.17		4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	1	2		1397/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	2	0		1406/1582			4.26	4.26	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	0	0		1559/1575		3.70		4.25	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	c	0	1	0	2	1	2	2 71	1059/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1 2	2 2		1024/1515	3.75 4.17	3.40	4.01 4.24	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	ь б	0	0	0	1 2	2 1	3 4		865/1511	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 994			4.27 3.94		4.29 ****
4. Were special techniques successiul	0	4	0	T	0	0	2	4.00		5.00	5.40	5.94	5.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	178/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	Ő	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	122/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	Ő	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	210/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	208/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	Ő	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	201/ 233		4.02			3.63
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.20	, 200					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies		-		ructor	Course	-			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1139/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3		1312/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1155/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1035/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	722/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	870/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1317/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1246/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	б	0	0	2.56	1618/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	2	1	0		1562/1586		4.17			3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	1	1	1		1568/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	1	0		1504/1582		3.81		4.26	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	1	1	0	0		****/1575		3.70			2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	б	0	1	0	2	1	2	2 71	1059/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	2		1024/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1 2	2 1	4	4.00	865/1511	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 994		3.46			+.49 ****
4. Weie special techniques successiui	0	т	0	Ŧ	0	0	2	1.00	/ //1	5.00	5.40	5.94	5.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	178/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	122/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	Ő	Õ	1	1	2	4	4.13	210/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	208/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	Ő	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	201/ 233		4.02			3.63
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.20	, 100					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201 Title ADVANCED LAB I Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A) Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 16

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1104/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1006/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	737/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1188/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1114/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	1090/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1270/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	664/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	б	5	3.93	1190/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1264/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	666/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1010/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	172/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	б	3	3	3.62	244/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	б	5	4.15	177/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.15
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	6	0	5	3.62	202/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.62

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	1						

	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	б	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	б	б	4.06	1104/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1006/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	737/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	5	б	3.93	1188/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	б	10	4.63	1114/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1260/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1427/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	4	2		1441/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1129/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	1355/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	З	2	З	3 78	1010/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	Ō	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994		3.46	3.94		3.60
T a la constance														
Laboratory	2	0	~	0	2	~	1.0	4 5 4	07/065	4 07	4 1 2	4 0 0	1 00	4 - 4
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	0	TO	4.54	87/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	172/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	244/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1 2	⊥ ⊂	6	5	4.15	177/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.15
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	U	2	ø	U	5	3.62	202/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.62

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-		-	
				?	1						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	б	б	4.06	1104/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1006/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	737/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1188/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	б	10	4.63	1114/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	4	4	0	2.83	1588/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1466/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1515/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1434/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	0	1	2	3.00	1487/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1010/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	З	0	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	172/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	6	3	ٽ ۲	3.62	244/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	177/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.15
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	6	0	5	3.62	202/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.62

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	4	General	0	Under-grad 2	16	Non-major	8	
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means 1	there a	re not enough		
				P	0			responses to b	be sign	ificant		
				I	0	Other	16	-	-			
				?	1							

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	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	3	5	11	19	31	4.01	1187/1674	4.24	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.01
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	18	24	20	3.77	1364/1674	4.14	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	9	14	21	22	3.72	1184/1423	4.03	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	53	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	****/1609	* * * *	3.67	4.22	4.27	* * * *
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	11	17	31	4.17	632/1585	4.32	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	51	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	****/1535	* * * *	3.77	4.08	4.15	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	7	11	27	20		1324/1651	4.09	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	67	5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	3	21	19	14	3.77	1222/1656	4.05	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	14	18	30	4.03	1290/1586	4.36	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	4	14	48	4.57	1166/1585	4.68	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	б	3	20	21	18	3.62	1367/1582	3.95	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	б	7	13	23	19	3.62	1346/1575	4.04	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	35	1	4	11	10	6	3.50	1036/1380	3.55	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	5	0	5	10	5	3.40	1221/1520	3.17	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	1	1	11	6	7	3.65	1256/1515	3.64	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	4	1	5	7	9		1286/1511	3.69	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	44	18	0	3	0	0	4	3.71	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 265	* * * *	4.13	4.23	4.26	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 278	* * * *	4.08	4.19	4.24	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	63	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 260	* * * *	4.41	4.46	4.49	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	1	0	1	0	2	2		****/ 259	* * * *	4.19	4.33	4.33	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.18	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	1	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	,	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00		* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	0	0	0	0	3	1		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	, .	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 52		3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351	1 0101
Title	ORGANIC	CHEMISTRY I
Instructor:	WHALEN,	DALE L
Enrollment:	153	
Questionnaires:	69	

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	4
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	В	24						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	65	Non-major	65
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	60				
				?	4						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-		Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	5	8	24	74	4.47	655/1674	4.24	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1 0	5 4	о б	24 31	74 71	4.4/	578/1674		3.76	4.27	4.20	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	1	5	10	34	61	4.34	760/1423	4.03	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	84	1	4	5	6	12		****/1609	****	3.67	4.22	4.27	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	24	1	3	7	20	57	4.47	360/1585		3.69	3.96	3.95	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	91	3	0	4	6	7		****/1535	****	3.77	4.08	4.15	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	10	35	64	4.43	643/1651	4.09	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	2	15	95	4.83	832/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	3	1	0	9	33	39	4.33	628/1656	4.05	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	5	22	82	4.68	633/1586	4.36	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	2	14	92	4.78	853/1585	4.68	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	5	11	41	51	4.28	914/1582	3.95	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	2	11	29	б4	4.46	742/1575	4.04	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	14	4	7	37	18	26	3.60	1001/1380	3.55	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	82	0	8	5	9	7	6	2.94	1390/1520	3.17	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	85	0	4	2	6	10	10		1267/1515	3.64	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	84	0	2	5	б	б	14		1221/1511	3.69	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	82	24	2	3	0	3	3	3.18	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	104	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	****/ 265	* * * *	4.13	4.23	4.26	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	106	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	****/ 278	* * * *	4.08	4.19	4.24	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	106	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	****/ 260	* * * *	4.41	4.46	4.49	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	106	2	0	1	0	3	5		****/ 259	* * * *	4.19	4.33	4.33	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	106	1	0	0	1	3	б	4.50	****/ 233	* * * *	4.02	4.20	4.18	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	111	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	112	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	112	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	112	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	113	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	113	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	113	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	113	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	113	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	113	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	113	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	113	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	113	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 0201
Title	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
Instructor:	SELEY, KATHERIN
Enrollment:	242
Questionnaires:	117

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Туре	Major	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	34	Required for Majors	2	Graduate 0	Major	4		
28-55	31	1.00-1.99	0	В	34							
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	9	C	18	General	0	Under-grad 117	Non-major	113		
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	14	D	2							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	40	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	1			responses to be	significant			
				I	0	Other	101					
				?	10							

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies				Instructor		Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	1511/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	2	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	2	3	3.00	1363/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1536/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	1260/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1223/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	1	4	3.58	1410/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	0	5	3	1	2.92	1576/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1168/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	1	5		1472/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	1	1	3		1493/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	1	1		1538/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	489/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	1	2	3 50	1169/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	2	0	2		1420/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	4	1	1		1420/1511		3.57	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	****
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	207/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	233/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	199/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	171/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0 Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	10	-				
				?	2							

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			3		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	1511/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	2	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	2	3	3.00	1363/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1536/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	б	2	2	3.45	1260/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1223/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	б	1	4	3.58	1410/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1139/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	2		1397/1585		4.30	4.69	4.66	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	1	1		1302/1582		3.81	4.26	4.26	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1138/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	1	З	3 50	1169/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	3	0	2		1420/1515		3.53	4.24	4.32	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	4	1	1		1420/1511		3.57	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	Ō	0		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	207/ 265		4.13	4.23	4.26	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	233/ 278		4.08	4.19	4.24	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	199/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.49	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	171/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0 Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	10	-				
				?	2							

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	б	4.55	558/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1009/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1107/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	645/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	512/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	215/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	б	4.36	727/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1124/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	704/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	857/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	1	1		1361/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1511		3.57	4.27	4.34	* * * *
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.70	51/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.70	72/278	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.20	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	63/260	4.57	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	0 8	4.80	45/250	4.29	4.41	4.40	4.49	4.80
<ol> <li>5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	1	2	8 6	4.80	45/259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.80
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	T	0	U	0	Ŧ	3	ю	4.50	12/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L L	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	558/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	б	4.18	1009/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1107/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	645/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	512/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	215/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	б	4.36	727/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1297/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1237/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	1	4		1448/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1240/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	1	1		1361/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	Ő	1	0	0	0	1		****/1511		3.57	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
- 1 .														
Laboratory	-	0	0	~	•	2	_	4 50	F1 / 06F	4 2 4	4 1 2	4 0 0	1 0 0	4 50
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	3	/	4.70	51/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	72/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1 1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	63/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance			0	0	0	2	8	4.80	45/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	Ţ	0	U	0	Ţ	3	6	4.50	72/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50

Credits E	s Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade			Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	8	4	4.08	1139/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	3		1446/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	5	2		1252/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	б	3	3.83	1266/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1372/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	8	2	3.75	1147/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1214/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1280/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	336/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	2	б	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.17
<ol><li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li></ol>	0	0	2	2	2	3	4	3.38	1408/1575		3.70	4.27		3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1065/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	1	3		1303/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	4	1	3		1414/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1405/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 265		4.13	4.23	4.26	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	104/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	115/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
<ol><li>To what degree could you discuss your evaluations</li></ol>	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 0301	University of Maryland	Page 330
Title	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Enrollment:	PERKS, H MARK H (Instr. A) 15	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Questions			Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins† Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	8	4	4.08	1139/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1446/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1252/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1266/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1372/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	8	2		1147/1535		3.77	4.08	4.15	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	3			1214/1651		3.82	4.18	4.16	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.92			4.89	4.69		4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	655/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	б	4.30	1104/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	1506/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	850/1582		3.81	4.26	4.26	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	1	2			1090/1575			4.27		3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	1	3		1303/1520		3.40	4.01	4.09	3.20
<ol><li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li></ol>	2	0	3	0	4	1	3		1414/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1405/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 265		4.13	4.23	4.26	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	б	4.40	116/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	7		94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	104/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33		4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	115/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * * * * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 0301		University o	f Maryland	Pag	e 331
Title	ORGANIC CHEMIST	RY LAB	Baltimore	County	JAN 21	, 2006
Instructor:	olewinski,Ron	(Instr. B)	Fall	2005	Job IR	BR3029
Enrollment:	15					
Questionnaires:	13		Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

		Frequencies In			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1	General	0	0	0	-	0	-	2	2 01	1000/1604	4 1 6	2 0 7	4 05	1 0 0	2 01
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0 0	0	1 0	2 4	5	3		1322/1674		3.87	4.27	4.26	3.91
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0 0	2	0 0	1	4	4 3	3 1		1271/1674	3.99 3.86	3.76 3.53	4.23 4.27	4.21 4.27	3.91 3.44
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		∠ 0	1	1 2	4 1	3 4	1		1287/1423	3.86 4.00			4.27	3.44
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2 1	1 4	4	3		1435/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22		3.55
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	∠ 3	4	3.82	996/1585		3.69	3.96	3.95 4.15	
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 1	0	1	2	4 2	3 2	4 3	4.00	870/1535 1485/1651	4.05 3.93	3.77 3.82	4.08 4.18	4.15	4.00 3.40
	Was the grading system clearly explained How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1 0	2 0	∠ 0	2 0	3 10	3.40 5.00	1/1673		3.82 4.89	4.18	4.16	3.40
		⊥ 3	0	0	0	2	3	10 3	5.00 4.13	871/1656			4.69	4.68	
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	U	0	Z	3	3	4.13	8/1/1050	3.92	3.00	4.07	4.07	3.81
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	931/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.64
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1267/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.16
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	б	4.27	914/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.92
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	0	б	3.82	1259/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.08
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	2	б	4.09	626/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.71
	Discussion														
1	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	З	1	4	3 78	1010/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	Ő	0	0	5	0	3		1209/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.75
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	1	2		1243/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.71
	Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	1	1	2		699/ 994		3.46	3.94		3.60
		-	-	_	-	_	_	_							
	Laboratory														
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	227/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.55
	Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	188/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.00
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	3	0	1	3	4	3.45	247/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.45
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	3	0	2	3	3	3.27	245/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.27
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	169/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.91
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
	Self Paced														
1	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	3.82	* * * *
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *
5.	Inter the second for all one second		0	Ũ	0	-	0	Ŭ	2.00	, 51		5.11			

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

P	0
I	0
?	1

Other

10

responses to be significant

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	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	1	2	5	3		1322/1674		3.87	4.27	4.26	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	3		1271/1674		3.76	4.23	4.21	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	3	1		1287/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	3		1435/1609		3.67	4.22	4.27	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	996/1585		3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	870/1535		3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	2	3		1485/1651		3.82	4.18	4.16	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1377/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1558/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1515/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1381/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1556/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1127/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1010/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	1209/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1243/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	227/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	188/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	3	0	1	3	4	3.45	247/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	3	0	2	3	3	3.27	245/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	169/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	

P	0
I	0
?	1

Other

10

responses to be significant

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	578/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	540/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	552/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	769/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	643/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1264/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	655/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	319/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	394/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	359/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	284/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.27
Discussion	~	0	1	0	-	-	-	4 1 2	860 /1 500	2 60	2 40	4 01	4 00	4 1 2
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0 0	1 2	0 0	1 2	1 1	5 3	4.13	760/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.13 3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6 6	0		0	2	1	3		1349/1515 1340/1511	3.48 3.74	3.53 3.57	4.24	4.32 4.34	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	6 6	4	2 0	0	2 1	2	-		474/ 994		3.57	4.27 3.94	4.34 3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	T	2	T	4.00	4/4/ 994	5.40	5.40	5.94	5.90	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	74/ 265	4.34		4.23	4.26	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	35/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	94/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.49	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	130/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	93/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.40
Seminar														* * * *
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13 13	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 1	5.00 5.00	****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	4.50 3.78	4.31 4.39	3.91 4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.83	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	12	0	0	0	0	0	T	5.00			3.03	4.14	3.40	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section: (	CHEM 351L 0501	University of Maryland	Page 334
Title (	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: H	PERKS, H MARK S (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	17		
Questionnaires:	14	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	б	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	578/1674		3.76	4.23	4.21	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	540/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	552/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	769/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2	б	4.27	643/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1264/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	б	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1415/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	б	0	0	0	1	1	б	4.63	1118/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	б	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1448/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	б	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1343/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	б	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	б	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	760/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1349/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1340/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	474/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	74/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	35/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	3	б	4.40	130/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	93/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
<ol><li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li></ol>	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05	01	University of Maryland	Page 335
Title	JAN 21, 2006			
Instructor:	un, Jian	(Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	17			
Questionnaires:	14		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Reasons Type					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	11					
				?	0							

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	0	2	8		1066/1674		3.87		4.26	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	3		1364/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	968/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	0	3			1094/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3		3.85	966/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 0	1 0	1 0	0 1	3 2	4 5	4		1083/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15 4.16	3.83 4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2 0	-		4.08	1050/1651 1/1673	3.93 4.97	3.82 4.89	4.18 4.69	4.16 4.68	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	2	⊥3 3		1139/1656			4.09		4.02
9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	T	0	0	7	2	2	3.09	1139/1030	5.92	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	738/1586		4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	10		1130/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	956/1582		3.81	4.26	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	4			1200/1575		3.70	4.27		4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	б	4.23	505/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	б	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	355/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.57
<ol><li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li></ol>	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	б	0	1	1	2	0			1328/1511	3.74			4.34	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	46/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	57/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	129/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	142/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	41/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 0601	University of Maryland	Page 336
Title	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PERKS, H MARK J (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	14		
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	0	2	8	4.15	1066/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1364/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	968/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	0	3	6	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	966/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	4	4		1083/1535		3.77	4.08	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5			1050/1651		3.82	4.18	4.16	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	849/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	858/1586		4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	4		1328/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5 5	0 0	0	1 0	0	1		4.50	632/1582		3.81	4.26	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0 4	1 0	0	0 1	3 1			1080/1575 ****/1380		3.70		4.25	4.02 4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	T	T	T	4.00	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.23
Discussion	-								0.55 / 1.500					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	355/1520		3.40	4.01	4.09	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1 2	2	3		1024/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	6 6	0 5	1 1	1 0	∠ 0	0 0	3 1		1328/1511 ****/ 994	3.74 3.46	3.57	4.27 3.94	4.34 3.96	3.43 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	T	0	U	U	T	3.00		5.40	5.40	5.94	5.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	46/ 265		4.13	4.23	4.26	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	57/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	129/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.49	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1 1	0 0	0 0	1 0	1 0	3 3	7 9	4.33 4.75	142/ 259		4.19 4.02		4.33	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	T	0	0	0	0	3	9	4./5	41/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.75
Seminar		-	0	0	0	-	0	4 0 0	**** / 100		4 1 1	4 41	4 1 0	de de de de
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 103	* * * * * * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * * * * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1 2	0	0 0	0	1	0		, -	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10 10	∠ 2	0 0	0	1 0	0 1	0 0		****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	3.78 3.83	4.39 4.14	4.29 3.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made creat	10	2	0	0	0	Т	0	4.00			5.05	4.14	3.40	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	,	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 0601		University c	of Maryland	P	age	337
Title	ORGANIC CHEMIS	TRY LAB	Baltimore	County	JAN	21,	2006
Instructor:	hu, Guozhang	(Instr. B)	Fall	2005	Job	IRBR	3029
Enrollment:	14						
Questionnaires:	13		Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire			

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1359/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	б	4.23	956/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1231/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1435/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1156/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	747/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	б	4.00	1097/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1139/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5		4.42	989/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	737/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	2			1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	6		1040/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	472/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.01
Discussion	0	0	0	0	2	•	-	2 50	1160/1500	2 60	2 40	4 01	4	2 5 2
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9 9	0 0	0	0 2	3 0	0	1 0		1169/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1 0	∠ 0	1	1 2	-		1485/1515 1050/1511	3.48 3.74	3.53	4.24	4.32 4.34	2.25 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	1	0	2 1	_		****/ 994		3.57	4.27 3.94	4.34 3.96	4.00 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	Ţ	Т	T	0	T	U	2.33		5.40	5.40	5.94	3.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	66/ 265	4.34		4.23	4.26	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	44/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	9		60/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.49	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	72/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	57/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.64
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	0	•	-	- 00	**** / 100	* * * *	4 1 1	4 4 7	4 1 0	* * * *
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12 12	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1		****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	$12 \\ 12$	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101 ****/ 95	****	4.50 4.50	4.48	4.30 3.91	* * * *
<ol> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	$12 \\ 12$	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50 3.78	4.31 4.39	3.91 4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	$12 \\ 12$	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.83	4.39	4.29	****
	12	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	5.00			5.05	4.14	5.40	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced		0												
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701 University of Maryland	Page 338
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: PERKS, H MARK H (Instr. A) Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 18	
Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	2	5	4	3.85	1359/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	б	4.23	956/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1231/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1435/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1156/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	747/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	б	4.00	1097/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	б	2	4.11	882/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	663/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	б	4	4.17	1434/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	б	4.45	704/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	819/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	902/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1169/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1485/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2			1050/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	66/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	44/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	60/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	72/ 259		4.19	4.33	4.33	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	57/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 0701	University of Maryland	Page 339
Title	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Enrollment:	olewinski,Ron (Instr. B) 18	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	7	4	4.08	1139/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4		1146/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	6	3		1173/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1035/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	б	2	3.69	1100/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	б	3	3.77	1140/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1097/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1260/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	б	7	4.54	826/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	896/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	690/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1050/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	859/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1221/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1341/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1291/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	196/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	120/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	148/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	4	б	4.08	144/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	б	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	1	1	-	4	4 0.0	1120/1694	4 1 6	2 0 7	4 07	1 00	4 0 0
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0 0	0 0	1 0	⊥ 4	5	4 4		1139/1674		3.87 3.76	4.27 4.23	4.26	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4 1	5			1146/1674	3.99 3.86	3.76	4.23	4.21 4.27	4.00 3.75
	-	1 2	0	1 0	1	6 8	3		1173/1423	3.86 4.00			4.27	3.75
<ol> <li>Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</li> <li>Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	0 0	∠ 0	0	1	⊥ 4	8 6	2 2		1035/1609	4.00 3.78	3.67 3.69	4.22 3.96	4.27 3.95	4.09 3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	1	1	4	6 6	∠ 3		1100/1585 1140/1535	3.78 4.05	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 U 0	0	0	0	4	5	4		1097/1651	4.05 3.93	3.82	4.08	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4 0	0	4 13	4.00 5.00	1/1673		3.82 4.89	4.10	4.10	4.00 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	5	13 6	4.55	352/1656		4.89	4.09		5.00 4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes:	5 4	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.55	322/1020	5.94	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	б	5	4.45	931/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1335/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	589/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1020/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	б	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	998/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	1		1221/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	1		1341/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	1		1291/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Tabaaa														
Laboratory	0	0	0	1	4	2	-	2 0 0	106/ 065	1 21	1 1 2	1 22	1 20	2 0 2
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1 0	4	3	5	3.92 4.38	196/ 265		4.13	4.23	4.26	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1 0 0	0	0		3	-	8		120/ 278 94/ 260	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities				0	1	2	10	4.69		4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1 2	2	2	8	4.31	148/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	144/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
Self Paced	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 0 0	++++/ ~1	* * * *	2.04	4 00	2 20	* * * *
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	U		****/ 61 ****/ 52	* * * * * * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	/ 52		3.13	4.26	3.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	б	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	558/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	790/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	901/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	645/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	996/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	548/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	843/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1222/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	б	4.27	1128/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	914/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1103/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	Õ	Ő	1	0	2	4.33	827/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	106/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	∠ 3	7	4.45	80/278	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.20	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.55	86/260	4.57	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.55
-	1	0	0	0	1	3 2	8	4.73	86/260 96/259	4.54	4.41	4.40	4.49	4.73
<ol> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> <li>Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	1	0	0	1	1	∠ 3	0 7	4.64	82/233	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.64
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	T	0	U	T	0	5	/	4.45	02/233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.10	4.45

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	б	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	558/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	790/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	901/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	645/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	996/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	б	4.36	548/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	843/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	955/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1120/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1225/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	б	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	850/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	б	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1040/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	827/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	106/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	80/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.73	86/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	96/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	82/233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.45
in the internet of the office of the productor	-	-	-	-	-	-								

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	1						

				equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1449/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	3.42	1535/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1323/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1285/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	907/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	767/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1214/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	9	1	3.75	1237/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	663/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	3	б	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	2		1367/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	2.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	489/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	0	2	2 22	1252/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	Ő	2	1	1		1452/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	Ő	1	0	1	2	2		1265/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	178/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2 2	0	1 0	0	1	4 E	4	4.00	137/278	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	∠ 3	0	0	0	⊥ 1	5 4	4	4.30	175/ 260	4.57	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	4		1	3.20	248/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	4	2	⊥ 3	3.20	169/233	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.20
5. Were requirements for rab reports creatly specified	2	0	0	0	-1	2	3	5.90	109/ 233	4.30	7.0Z	7.20	7.10	5.90

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	1						

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	0	2	2	б	2	3.67	1449/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.67
0	0	0	1	5	6	0	3.42	1535/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.42
1	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1323/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.30
0	2	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1285/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.80
0	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	907/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.91
0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	767/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.17
0	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1214/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.92
0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
0	0	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1528/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.42
2	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1400/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.23
2	-	2	-	4	2	2		,					4.06
					1	2							3.65
	Ő	3	-	-	2	0		. ,					2.97
1	5	1	2	1	0	2			4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.63
-	0	-	•	2	0	~		1050/1500	2 60	2 40	4 01	4 0.0	2 22
-	•	T	-	3	0	2		- ,					3.33
-	-	2	-	2	T	Ţ		- ,					2.83
6	-	1	-	Ţ	2	2		, .					3.67 ****
6	5	T	0	U	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.40	3.46	3.94	3.96	
2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	178/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00
2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	137/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30
3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	175/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.33
2	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	248/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.20
2	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	169/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.90
	0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	NR         NA         1           0         0         0         0           1         1         1         1           0         2         1         0         1           0         1         0         1         0           0         1         0         0         0           0         0         0         0         0           0         0         0         0         0           2         0         0         2         0           2         0         1         3         3           1         5         1         1         1           6         0         1         5         1           6         0         1         6         5         1           2         0         1         6         5         1           2         0         1         6         5         1           2         0         1         2         0         1           2         0         1         2         0         1           2         0         0         3	NR         NA         1         2           0         0         0         1           1         1         1         0           0         2         1         1           0         1         1         1           1         1         1         0           0         1         0         1           0         1         0         1           0         0         0         1           0         0         0         0           0         0         1         2           2         0         0         0           2         0         1         0           2         0         1         0           3         0         3         1           1         5         1         2           6         0         1         0           6         2         0         1           2         0         1         0           4         2         0         0         0           3         0         0         0         0	NR         NA         1         2         3           0         0         0         1         5           1         1         1         0         5           1         1         1         0         5           1         1         1         0         5           0         2         1         1         2           0         0         0         1         2           0         0         0         1         2           0         0         0         0         4           0         0         0         0         4           2         0         2         0         4           2         0         1         0         6           3         0         3         1         3           1         5         1         2         1           6         0         1         0         3           6         0         1         0         1           6         5         1         0         0           2         0         1         0         1	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5           0         0         0         1         5         6         0           1         1         1         0         5         3         1           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3         1           0         2         1         1         2         5         3         1           0         1         0         1         2         5         3         6           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1           0         0         0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1           2         0         0         0         4         4         2         2         1         1         1         1         2         1         1           2         0         0         0         4         1         2         0         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean           0         0         0         1         5         6         0         3.42           1         1         1         0         5         3         1         3.30           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3         1.3.30           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3         3.91           0         0         0         1         2         3         6         4.17           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         3.92           0         0         0         0         0         12         5.00           0         0         0         0         12         5.00           0         0         1         2         5         3         1         3.08           2         0         2         0         4         2         3.80           2         0         1         0         3         0         2         3.00 <td>NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank           0         0         0         1         5         6         0         3.42         1535/1674           1         1         1         0         5         3         1         3.30         1323/1423           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3.80         1285/1609           0         1         0         1         2         5         3         3.91         907/1585           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         3.91         907/1585           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1.308         1285/1609           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1.309         1285/1609           0         0         0         0         1         2         3         3.92         1214/1651           0         0         1         2         3.80         1400/1586         1400/1586           2         0         1</td> <td>NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean           0         0         0         2         2         6         2         3.67         1449/1674         4.16           0         0         1         5         6         0         3.42         1535/1674         3.99           1         1         0         5         3         1         3.30         1323/1423         3.86           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3.80         1285/1609         4.00           0         1         0         1         2         3         6         4.17         767/1535         4.05           0         0         0         1         2         3         6         4.17         767/1535         4.05           0         0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1         3.08         1528/1656         3.92           2         0         0         0         1         2         3.00         1464/1582         4.13           3         0         3</td> <td>NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean         Mean           0         0         0         1         5         6         0         3.42         1535/1674         3.19         3.76           1         1         1         0         5         3         1         3.30         1323/1423         3.86         3.53           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3.80         1285/1609         4.00         3.67           0         1         1         2         5         3         3.91         907/1585         3.78         3.69           0         0         1         2         3         6         4.17         767/1535         4.05         3.77           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1         3.08         1400/1586         4.39         4.17           2         0         0         0         1         2         3.80         1400/1586         4.39         4.17           2         0         1         6         1         2</td> <td>NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean         Mean</td> <td>NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean         Mean</td>	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank           0         0         0         1         5         6         0         3.42         1535/1674           1         1         1         0         5         3         1         3.30         1323/1423           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3.80         1285/1609           0         1         0         1         2         5         3         3.91         907/1585           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         3.91         907/1585           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1.308         1285/1609           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1.309         1285/1609           0         0         0         0         1         2         3         3.92         1214/1651           0         0         1         2         3.80         1400/1586         1400/1586           2         0         1	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean           0         0         0         2         2         6         2         3.67         1449/1674         4.16           0         0         1         5         6         0         3.42         1535/1674         3.99           1         1         0         5         3         1         3.30         1323/1423         3.86           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3.80         1285/1609         4.00           0         1         0         1         2         3         6         4.17         767/1535         4.05           0         0         0         1         2         3         6         4.17         767/1535         4.05           0         0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1         3.08         1528/1656         3.92           2         0         0         0         1         2         3.00         1464/1582         4.13           3         0         3	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean         Mean           0         0         0         1         5         6         0         3.42         1535/1674         3.19         3.76           1         1         1         0         5         3         1         3.30         1323/1423         3.86         3.53           0         2         1         1         2         1         5         3.80         1285/1609         4.00         3.67           0         1         1         2         5         3         3.91         907/1585         3.78         3.69           0         0         1         2         3         6         4.17         767/1535         4.05         3.77           0         0         0         1         2         5         3         1         3.08         1400/1586         4.39         4.17           2         0         0         0         1         2         3.80         1400/1586         4.39         4.17           2         0         1         6         1         2	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean         Mean	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean         Mean

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	1						

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1196/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1104/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1016/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	715/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	б	4	3.73	1066/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	9	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	5	б	4.07	1057/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	955/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	723/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	690/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1080/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	10	3	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	2	1	1	2 63	1461/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	4	1	0		1470/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	3	2	1	1		1466/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
T a base of the second														
Laboratory	4	0	~	~	~	2	-	4 05	146/ 065	4 2 4	4 1 2	4 0 0	1 00	4 05
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0 0	0	2	0	3	/	4.25	146/ 265 130/ 278	4.34 4.37		4.23 4.19	4.26	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4 4	-	1 0	0 0	1 2	1	8	4.33 4.58	,		4.08		4.24	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	-	0	2	0	∠ 2	1	9 C		122/ 260 212/ 259	4.54	4.41	4.46 4.33	4.49	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4 4	0	2	1	2	2 4	6	3.83	,	4.29	4.19		4.33	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	U	U	Т	2	4	5	4.08	143/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.08

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	б	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	0						

				-	ncies				ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1196/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1104/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1016/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	715/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	6	4	3.73	1066/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	9	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	5	б	4.07	1057/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	2	б	1	3.45	1399/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1054/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	7		1383/1585		4.30	4.69	4.66	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	2	4	4		1434/1582		3.81	4.26	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	7	3		1336/1575		3.70	4.27	4.25	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	2	3	3		810/1380		3.62	3.94	4.01	
Discussion														
	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	2 62	1461/1520	2 60	2 40	4 01	4.09	2 62
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2 2	2	2	1	1 0		1461/1520		3.40	4.01 4.24	4.09	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	-	0	1	⊥ 3	4	1	1		.,		3.53		4.34	2.50 2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8 8	6	1	3	∠ 0	1	1 2		1466/1511 ****/ 994		3.57 3.46	4.27 3.94	4.34	⊿./⊃ ****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.40	3.40	3.94	3.90	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	146/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	130/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	122/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	2	2	б	3.83	212/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	143/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.08

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA E			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	б	2.00-2.99	2	С	1 General		0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

	-			Inst	structor Course Dept UMBC Level Sec				Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	1066/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1484/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	1	6	2	3.42	1296/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1360/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	976/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	1	2			1273/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4			1377/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0			1001/1673		4.89	4.69	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1237/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	1044/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	0	1	9	4.25	1397/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	2	1	б	3.58	1378/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	1	2	б	3.67	1329/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	131/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1027/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1267/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1155/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	932/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	74/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	199/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	171/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	124/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 1201	University of Maryland	Page 348
Title	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PERKS, H MARK M (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	16		
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	
Instructor: Enrollment:	PERKS, H MARK M (Instr. A) 16	Fall 2005	

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

		Frequencies			Inst	Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level S				Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	0	0	1	1	0	4	7	4 1 5	1066/1674	4 1 C	2 07	4 07	1 20	4 1 5
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	0 0	0 0	1 2	1 1	0 2	4 4	7 4		1066/1674 1484/1674		3.87 3.76	4.27 4.23	4.26 4.21	4.15 3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	2 1	4 6	2		1296/1423	3.86	3.53	4.23	4.21	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	4	5		1360/1423	4.00	3.55	4.22	4.27	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	976/1585		3.69	3.96	3.95	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	1	2	5		1273/1535		3.77	4.08	4.15	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4			1377/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	Ő	0	1	0	0			1001/1673		4.89	4.69		4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	10		106/1656			4.07	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	753/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1423/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	777/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	б	4.20	1010/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	3	3		1027/1520		3.40	4.01	4.09	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	3	2		1267/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	3		1155/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	2	1	1	Ţ	2.83	932/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	74/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	199/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.49	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	171/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	0	2	б	4.20	124/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * * * * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0 0	0 1	1 0	0	0	1		****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	11 11	0	1	0	0 0	0 0	1 1	3.00	,	****	3.78 3.83	4.39 4.14	4.29 3.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	ΤT	0	Ţ	0	0	U	T	3.00			3.03	4.14	3.40	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 1201	L	University o	of Maryland	P	age 349
Title	ORGANIC CHEMIS	STRY LAB	Baltimore	County	JAN	21, 2006
Instructor:	otel, Billy	(Instr. B)	Fall	2005	Job	IRBR3029
Enrollment:	16					
Questionnaires:	13		Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire		

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	891/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	870/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	б	б	4.38	718/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	490/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	б	5	4.23	575/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	836/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	889/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	849/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	З	8	4.58	774/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	737/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	850/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	806/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	463/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	2 50	****/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/1515	3.48	3.40	4.01 4.24	4.09	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/1511		3.53	4.24	4.34	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	T	T	0	0	2.50	****/1511	3.74	3.5/	4.27	4.34	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	132/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	57/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	б	0	0	0	0	2	б	4.75	77/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	б	4.67	89/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	66/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.56

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	L	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

						Inst	ructor			UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	891/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	870/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	б	6	4.38	718/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	490/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	б	5	4.23	575/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	836/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	889/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	214/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	945/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	6		1071/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	847/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	1	1	1		****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.29
Discussion	10	0	~	1	0	~	1	2 50	**** /1 5 0 0	2 60	2 40	4 0 1	4 0 0	* * * *
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	Ţ	0	0	Ţ		****/1520		3.40	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	Ţ	T	0	0	2.50	****/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	132/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	57/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	б	4.75	77/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	89/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	66/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.56

Credits Ea	Credits Earned C			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	1	6	10	4.39	792/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1 3	2	8	10 5		1319/1674	4.10 3.99	3.76	4.27	4.20	4.39 3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	6		980/1423	3.86	3.53	4.23	4.21	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	7	6		1185/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	2	8	3.82	986/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	494/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	7		1240/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	2	7		4.13	871/1656			4.07		4.06
	-	-	0	-	-		Ũ		0,1,1000	5172	5.00	1.07	1.07	1100
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	453/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	615/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	3	9		1070/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	940/1575	3.91		4.27	4.25	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	303/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	512/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 994	3.46		3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	81/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 260	4.54		4.46	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	81/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	97/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	* * * *	****	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 0.0	****/ 61	****	2 04	1 00	3.20	* * * *
<ol> <li>Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> </ol>	17 17	0	0	0	0 0	0	⊥ 1	5.00 5.00	****/ 35	****	2.94 3.71	4.09 4.36	3.20 3.29	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****		4.36 4.34		****
5. Were chere enough produots for all the students	т /	0	0	0	0	U	Ŧ	5.00			5.1/	4.54	4.49	

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 1401	University of Maryland	Page 352
Title	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PERKS, H MARK B (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	17		
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	б							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad 1	L7	Non-major	18	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here a	re not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to b	oe sign	ificant		
				I	0	Other	18					
				?	0							

				-	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	б	10	4.39	792/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	8	5		1319/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	6		980/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	7	б	3.94	1185/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	2	8	3.82	986/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	494/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1240/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	1073/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	2	0	б	4.22	1168/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	1335/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	914/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	1010/1575	3.91	3.70		4.25	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	512/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	81/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 260	4.54		4.46	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	81/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	97/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced			_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 1401		University o	f Maryland	Page	353
Title	ORGANIC CHEMIS	STRY LAB	Baltimore	County	JAN 21,	2006
Instructor:	akke, Brian	(Instr. B)	Fall	2005	Job IRBR	3029
Enrollment:	17					
Questionnaires:	18		Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Туре		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

				Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		-		Mean	
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	792/1674		3.87		4.26	4.39
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	8	5		1319/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.83
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	6		980/1423	3.86		4.27	4.27	4.06
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2 0	0	7	6		1185/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.94
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 1	0	2 1	0	5 0	2 6	8	3.82	986/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0 4	6 4	10 7	4.41	494/1535 1240/1651	4.05 3.93	3.77 3.82	4.08 4.18	$4.15 \\ 4.16$	4.41 3.88
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1 0	4	4	17	5.00	1/1673		3.82 4.89	4.18 4.69	4.16 4.68	3.88 5.00
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	⊥ 3	0	0	0	2	9		5.00 4.13	860/1656	4.97 3.92		4.69	4.68	
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	Z	9	4	4.13	000/1000	5.94	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.00
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	663/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.68
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.33
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	692/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.33
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	512/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.40
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0		4.60	543/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.60
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511		3.57	4.27	4.34	4.60
4.	Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	* * * *
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54
	Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	81/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.54
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	Ő	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	- 9	4.69	81/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.69
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	Ő	0	1	1	3	-	4.38	97/ 233		4.02			4.38
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	* * * *
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 48	* * * *	∠./⊥ ****	4.12	4.03 3.67	* * * *
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
5.	214 Conferences help for carry out field detivities	± /	0	5	5	5	-	0	1.00	, 15			1.21	5.21	
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 1401	University of Maryland	Page 354
Title	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	(Instr. C)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	17		
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Inst	ructor	Course Dept				Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	6	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	б	4.50	578/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	870/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1228/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	615/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	З	7	4.70	618/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	Ő	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	882/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1264/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	622/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3 33	1252/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	1		1361/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	2		1265/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	142/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	52/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	127/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	134/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.14

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-	-		
				?	1						

						Instructor		Course Dept Mean Mean				Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	б	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	б	4.50	578/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	870/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1228/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	955/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1529/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	1	2		1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1367/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	б	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	2 22	1252/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	1		1361/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	2		1265/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory		-				-								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	Ţ	0	0	1	Ţ	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	142/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	52/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	127/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	U	U	U	2	2	3	4.14	134/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.14

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Туре	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0 #### - Means the		there	ere are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	10	-				
				?	1							

Questions 1		NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins† Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1309/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	1146/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1214/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	2	б	4.08	1042/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1223/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	0	5	3.45	1313/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	3		1324/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2 6	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	871/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	7		1074/1586		4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	7		1191/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	3	5		1129/1582		3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	3	3		1384/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	2	б	4.18	549/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.97
Discussion	0	0	~	1	0	1	0	0 0 0	1 400 / 1 500	2 60	2 40	4 01	4 0 0	0 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0 0	2	1 1	2	1	0		1488/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8 8	0	0 0	1	2 3	0 1	3 2		1167/1515 1177/1511	3.48 3.74	3.53 3.57	4.24	4.32 4.34	3.83 3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	3 1	1	_		847/994			4.27	4.34 3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	Ţ	T	T	Т	0	2	3.20	047/ 994	3.40	5.40	5.94	3.90	5.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	178/ 265	4.34		4.23	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	226/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	2		4.18	201/ 260		4.41	4.46	4.49	4.18
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	185/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.10
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	150/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.00
Seminar														****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0 0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13 13	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 101 ****/ 95	****	4.50 4.50	4.48	4.30 3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	0 1	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50 3.78	4.31 4.39	3.91 4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.83	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	5.00	91		5.05	4.14	3.40	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	3.27	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * * * * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 1601	University of Maryland	Page 357
Title	ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	PERKS, H MARK S (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	18		
Questionnaires	14	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Туре	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad 1	4	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means ti	here a	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

	Frequencies			Instructor		ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	5	3	3 92	1309/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	1	6		1146/1674		3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	2	4		1214/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	2	6		1042/1609		3.67	4.22	4.27	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	2	4		1223/1585		3.69	3.96	3.95	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	0	5		1313/1535		3.77	4.08	4.15	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	3		1324/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	5	0	3.57	1344/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1224/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1383/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1381/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1309/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	902/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	1	0		1488/1520		3.40	4.01	4.09	2.33
<ol><li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li></ol>	8	0	0	1	2	0	3		1167/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	1	2		1177/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	847/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	178/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	226/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	201/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.18
<ol><li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li></ol>	3	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	185/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.10
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	б	3	4.00	150/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.10	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.30	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	3.91	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * * * * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work			_		_		_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.03	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	3.70	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	3.87	* * * * * * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13 13	0 0	0	0 0	0	1	0	4.00	, -	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	~ ~ ~ ^		4.27	3.27	~ ~ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	3.20	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	3.50	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	4.29	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16	01	University of Maryland	Page 358
Title	ORGANIC CHEM	ISTRY LAB	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	un, Jian	(Instr. B)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	18			
Questionnaires:	14		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad 1	4	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NA	Fre 1	-	ncies 3	3 4	5		ructor Rank	Course	-			
	Questions	NR 	NA 	⊥ 			4		Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did vou gain new ins:	ights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor ma	ake clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.38
	ns reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	672/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations	s reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1242/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.88
5. Did assigned readings	s contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	769/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignme	nts contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	807/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading syste	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1246/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was c	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	849/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1 Were the instructor!	Ο	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	723/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.31	
	<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>			0	0	0	2	6	4.75	917/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.38
	presented and explained clearly	0	0 0	0	0	0	4	4		632/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.42
	tribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4		692/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27		4.42
	niques enhance your understanding	0	Õ	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	227/1380		3.62		4.01	
5. Dia addiovibaai eeem	inques emianee your understanding	0	Ū	0	0	0	5	5	1.05	22771500	1.00	5.02	5.51	1.01	1.51
	Discussion														
1. Did class discussions	s contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1129/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.60
2. Were all students act	tively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1180/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.80
3. Did the instructor en	ncourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1050/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniq	ues successful	2	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	676/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.67
	Laboratory														
1 Did the lab increase	understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	1	Δ	4.33	132/ 265	4 34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33
	th adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	2	ד 2	4.17	170/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.17
		2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.33	175/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.33
<ol> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> </ol>			0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	142/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified				1	0	0	1	4	4.17	130/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	
	2	0	-	5	5	-	-	/	100, 200	1.50	1.02	1.20	1.10	/	
Seminar															
Seminar 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *

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

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions				-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	-			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	4	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	672/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1242/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	769/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	807/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1246/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1237/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4 00	1300/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4 4 2	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	1		1472/1585		4.30			4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	2		850/1582		3.81			4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	õ	0	0	1	0		4.33			3.70			4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	1	1		666/1380		3.62		4.01	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	1		1129/1520		3.40	4.01		3.60
<ol><li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li></ol>	3	0	0	0	2	2	1		1180/1515		3.53	4.24		3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	1		1050/1511		3.57		4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	676/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	132/ 265	4.34	4 1 3	4.23	4.26	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	170/ 278		4.08	4.19		4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	175/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	142/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33		4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	130/ 233		4.02	4.20	4.18	
Seminar	-	0	~	0	1	0	~	2 0 0	TTTT / 00	الريان بالريان	2 70	4 20	4 00	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	T	0	U	3.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.29	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	ed Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons					Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	8	12	4.15	1066/1674	4.15	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	12	6	3.77	1364/1674	3.77	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	12	6	3.69	1197/1423	3.69	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	2	9	1	3.77	1313/1609	3.77	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	5	5	4	3.19	1388/1585	3.19	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	2	1	б	3	3.83	1083/1535	3.83	3.77	4.08	4.18	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	5	8	9	3.84	1264/1651	3.84	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	283/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	3	5	10	2	3.55	1353/1656	3.55	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	2	7	12	4 13	1237/1586	4.13	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	19		1071/1585	4.67	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	3	10	7		1278/1582	3.79	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	- 5	13	4.22	992/1575	4.22	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	1	2	2	3	1		1205/1380	3.11	3.62	3.94	4.04	
······································	-		_	_	_	-	_		,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	780/1520	4.09	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	798/1515	4.36	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	955/1511	4.20	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	346/ 994	4.29	3.46	3.94	4.19	4.29

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	1	11	4.57	521/1674	4.57	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	338/1674	4.69	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1423	4.80	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1609	4.91	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.67	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	145/1651	4.86	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	б	4.46	437/1656	4.46	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	366/1582	4.71	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	523/1575	4.64	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	1	4	3 75	1027/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	Ō	0	2	5	4.25	898/1515	4.25	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	Ő	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	642/1511	4.50	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	4.19	****
T - have been														
Laboratory	1 1	1	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	++++ / 265	* * * *	4.13	4.23	4.53	* * * *
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11 13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 265 ****/ 278	****			4.53	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13 13	0	-	-	-	0	⊥ 1		****/ 2/8	****	4.08	4.19 4.46		****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.41		4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	U	U	U	U	U	T	5.00	****/ 233	~ ~ ~ *	4.02	4.20	4.10	~ ^ ^ ^

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	б	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	4	5	4.56	546/1674	4.56	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	968/1674	4.22	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	б	4.56	517/1423	4.56	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	926/1585	3.89	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	б	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	238/1535	4.67	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1651	4.33	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	874/1585	4.78	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	967/1582	4.22	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1575	4.78	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	б	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	629/1515	4.50	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1511	4.50	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	8	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	encie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	0	2	15	38	53	4.31	878/1674	4.31	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	7	27	42	31	3.88	1291/1674	3.88	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	3	15	27	34	29	3.66	1220/1423	3.66	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	50	5	8	13	18	13	3.46	1468/1609	3.46	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	8	27	36	31	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	51	5	5	13	14	16	3.58	1251/1535	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.18	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	2	8	10	23	24	36	3.69	1364/1651	3.69	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	1	0	0	1	9	93	4.89	724/1673	4.89	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	4	1	1	17	32	39	4.19	805/1656	3.72	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	13	27	67	4.46	931/1586	4.44	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	3	19	85	4.74	938/1585		4.30	4.69	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	2	14	30	62	4.38	808/1582		3.81	4.26	4.31	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	5	30	70	4.53	669/1575	4.11	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	26	5	б	20	16	29	3.76	894/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	б	1	13	10	10		1210/1520		3.40	4.01	4.18	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	76	0	2	3	9	16	11		1209/1515	3.76	3.53	4.24	4.40	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	3	3	9	16	11		1253/1511	3.69	3.57	4.27	4.45	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	77	27	0	5	2	4	2	3.23	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	4.19	* * * *
Laboratory				_	_		_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	2	0	0	2	Ţ	0		****/ 265	****	4.13		4.53	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	115	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	* * * *	4.08	4.19	4.21	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	115	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.42	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	116	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.65	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	116	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	4.60	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	116	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.57	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	4.46	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.86	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	5.00	* * * *

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	5
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	14	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	33						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	8	С	24	General	9	Under-grad	103	Non-major	104
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	14	D	3						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	77				
				?	6						

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	0	2	15	38	53	4.31	878/1674	4.31	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	7	27	42	31	3.88	1291/1674	3.88	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	3	15	27	34	29	3.66	1220/1423	3.66	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	50	5	8	13	18	13	3.46	1468/1609	3.46	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	8	27	36	31	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	51	5	5	13	14	16	3.58	1251/1535	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.18	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	2	8	10	23	24		3.69	1364/1651	3.69	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	1	0	0	1	9	93		724/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	0	10	8	30	26	12	3.26	1474/1656	3.72	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	2	11	25	58	4.41	989/1586	4.44	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	3	2	10	26	55		1354/1585	4.54	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	5	15	19	33	25		1374/1582		3.81	4.26	4.31	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	8	13	13	27	34		1318/1575		3.70	4.27	4.35	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	15	11	6	11	20	30	3.67	962/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	6	1	13	10	10	3.42	1210/1520	3.43	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	76	0	2	3	9	16	11	3.76	1209/1515	3.76	3.53	4.24	4.40	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	3	3	9	16	11		1253/1511	3.69	3.57	4.27	4.45	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	77	27	0	5	2	4	2	3.23	****/ 994	* * * *	3.46	3.94	4.19	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	2	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 265	* * * *	4.13	4.23	4.53	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	115	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	* * * *	4.08	4.19	4.21	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	115	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	* * * *	4.11	4.41	4.42	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	116	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.65	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	116	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	* * * *	4.50	4.31	4.60	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	116	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.57	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	4.46	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.86	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	5.00	* * * *

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	5
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	14	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	33						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	8	С	24	General	9	Under-grad	103	Non-major	104
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	14	D	3						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	77				
				?	6						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	928/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1146/1674		3.76	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1231/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	443/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1006/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	440/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	б	4.00	1097/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1139/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	1	З	3 55	1472/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	786/1585		4.30	4.69	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	2		1320/1582		3.81	4.26	4.31	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	1	5		1259/1575				4.35	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	1	1	2		1196/1380		3.62		4.04	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.14	743/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.14	971/1515	3.61 3.62	3.40	4.01 4.24	4.10	4.14 4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	990/1511		3.55	4.24	4.45	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	59/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	142/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	207/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	179/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	88/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.65	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	б	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	928/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	5		1146/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	4		1231/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	443/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1006/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	440/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	б	4.00	1097/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	465/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.17
Lecture	4	0	~	~	~	2	4	4 6 7	<b>DOA</b> /1 EOC	2 60	4 1 17	4 4 2	1 10	1 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	784/1586 1002/1585	3.68 4.56	4.17		4.46	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	2	5	4.71	,		4.30	4.69	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	1		903/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	4	-	0	T	4	1		1138/1575	3.50			4.35	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	743/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	971/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	990/1511	3.81	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	* * * *
Laboratory		_	_	-	_		_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	59/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	142/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	207/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	179/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	88/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 101	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.65	* * * *

Credits Earned		rned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad 1	11	Non-major	11
84-150	б	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0 #### - Means there		there	e are not enough	
				P	0			responses to b	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

0	NTD	<b>N</b> T 7		equer 2	ncies 3		F		ructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	1			4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1291/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	3		1237/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3		1094/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1			1181/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	538/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	3		1324/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0 0	0	0	0 1	0		5.00	1/1673		4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	U	0	T	2	3	4.33	615/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.33
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	1144/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	5	1	3.63	1363/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1080/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	585/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	616/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	990/1511		3.57	4.27	4.45	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	4.50
Tabanatan														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	141/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1 1	0	1	1	1	1	3	4.29	235/ 278	4.20 3.51	4.13	4.23	4.33	4.29 3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.19	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1		4.57	107/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2		3.86	176/ 233		4.02	4.20	4.10	3.86
Seminar	~	0	0	~	~	1	1	4 50	FC / 100	4 50	4 1 1	4 4 7	4 40	4 50
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	1	1		56/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0 0	1 1	1 1	4.50 4.50	55/ 101	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.65	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6 6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.50	43/ 95 70/ 99	4.50 4.00	4.50 3.78	4.31 4.39	4.60 4.57	4.50 4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	50/97	4.00	3.83	4.39		4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	0	0	0	0	Ŧ	0	-	4.00	507 51	1.00	5.05	1.11	1.10	1.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.86	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	4.24	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.86	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.13	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.48	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	5.00	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	5.00	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	* * * *	* * * *	4.44	5.00	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	* * * *	3.71	4.36	5.00	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	* * * *	3.17	4.34	5.00	* * * *

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 0201	University of Maryland	Page 368
Title	BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR	Baltimore County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Lease, Richard (Instr. A)	Fall 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	9		
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	б	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	0		are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	4	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	Ő	4	1	3		1291/1674		3.76	4.23	4.31	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	3		1237/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3		1094/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1181/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	538/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1324/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	615/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1518/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1441/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1326/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	4	1	3.29	1437/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	616/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	990/1511	3.81	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	141/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	235/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	4		4.00	215/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1		4.57	107/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	176/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	3.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	1		56/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	55/ 101	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.65	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1		43/ 95	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1		70/ 99	4.00	3.78	4.39	4.57	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	3.83	4.14	4.46	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	* * * *	2.71	3.98	4.86	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	* * * *	2.33	3.93	4.24	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.86	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	* * * *	* * * *	4.12	4.13	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	* * * *	* * * *	4.27	4.48	* * * *
Self Paced	_	-	~	~	~	-	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	5.00	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7 7	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 0	0 1	0 0	3.00	****/ 35 ****/ 31	* * * * * * * *	3.71	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	/	U	U	U	U	T	U	4.00	****/ 31	~ ~ ~ ^	3.17	4.34	5.00	

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02	01	University o	f Maryland	Page 369
Title	BIOCHEMISTRY	LABORATOR	Baltimore	County	JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:	Lin, Yun	(Instr. B)	Fall	2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	9				
Questionnaires:	8		Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	б	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	0		are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Questions				-	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1334/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1644/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1400/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1236/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	1562/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	2.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	б	2	4.25	667/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1562/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	б	4.75	958/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	4	2	0	2.78	1596/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	1562/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	2.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	Ő	0	1	1	1	5		1397/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	1	2	1		1561/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	2.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	0	1	1	2.29	1558/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	2.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	З	1	1	3 00	1353/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	2	1	0		1483/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	2.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	Ő	1	0	3	3	0		1396/1511		3.57	4.27	4.45	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 994			3.94	4.19	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	Δ	2	3.89	202/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	272/278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	2.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.44	150/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.56	232/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	3.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	3.00	232/233		4.02		4.10	
5. Here requirements for fas reports creatly specified	0	0	5	5	5	5	0	5.00	221/200	5.70	1.02	1.20	1.10	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	****

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

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions				-	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1334/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	1	1		1644/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1400/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1236/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	1562/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	2.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	667/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1562/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	б	4.75	958/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1237/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	2.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	Ő	0	0	1	1	0		****/1585		4.30		4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/1582		3.81		4.31	2.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1575	3.50	3.70		4.35	2.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	2 00	1353/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	2	1	0		1483/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.10	2.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	3	0		1396/1511	3.81	3.55		4.45	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	4.19	****
I were spectar coominged subcestar	-	Ū	0	-	0	0	0	2.00	, ,, ,,	1.50	5.10	5.71	1112	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	202/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	272/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	2.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	150/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	232/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	3.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified			0	3	3	3	0	3.00	221/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	* * * *

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

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Instructor		Course Dep		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	485/1674	4.60	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	697/1423	4.40	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	645/1609	4.40	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.69	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.77	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.60	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.50	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.50
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.17	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.80	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	379/1380	4.40	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	4.33	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	827/1515	4.33	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.33
Tabauatau														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 265	4.67	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	∠ 3	4.87 5.00	1/ 278	4.07	4.13	4.23	4.33	4.07 5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	∠ 2	0	0	0	0	1	3 2	5.00 4.67	102/260	5.00 4.67	4.08	4.19	4.21 4.24	5.00 4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	0	0	∠ 3	4.87 5.00	1/ 259	4.07	4.41	4.40	4.24	4.07 5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2 2	0	0	0	0	0	с З	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.19	4.33	4.31	5.00
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	4	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	⊥/ ∠33	5.00	4.02	4.20	4.10	5.00

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

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	118/1674	4.93	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	237/1674	4.79	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	493/1423	4.57	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	629/1609	4.42	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	276/1651	4.71	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1155/1673	4.57	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	144/1656	4.82	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.17	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.30	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	121/1582	4.93	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1575	4.93	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1380	4.89	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	355/1520	4.57	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	568/1515		3.53	4.24	4.40	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	_⊥ ⊥	⊥ 1	5	4.37	301/1511	4.37	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.57
5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	/	U	U	U	U	T	0	4.00	301/1311	4.00	3.57	4.2/	4.40	4.00

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	б						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer					ructor		-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	8	10	4.56	546/1674	4.56	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	906/1674	4.28	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	575/1423	4.50	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	743/1609	4.33	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	б	5	3	3.35	1320/1585	3.35	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1066/1535	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.18	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	1	7	4	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1434/1673	4.24	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	615/1656	4.33	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	150/1586	4.94	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	11	3	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	669/1575	4.53	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	З	4	2	3 55	1153/1520	3.55	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	, 7	0	0	0	2	7	2		1024/1515	4.00	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	Ő	2	2	7	0		1320/1511	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.45	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 994	****		3.94	4.19	****
- 1														
Laboratory	1 7	0	0	0	~	~	1	F 00	**** / 070	* * * *	4 0 0	4 1 0	4 01	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1/	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	~ ~ ~ ~	4.08	4.19	4.21	~ ~ ~ ~
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	* * * *	4.50	4.48	4.65	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	* * * *	3.78	4.39	4.57	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	* * * *	3.83	4.14	4.46	* * * *
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	* * * *	* * * *	4.45	4.86	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	* * * *	2.94	4.09	5.00	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	* * * *	3.13	4.26	5.00	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 50	* * * *	****	4.44	5.00	* * * *
	± ·	0	Ŭ	Ũ		-	Ũ	1.00	, 50				2.00	

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

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean	lean
General	
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 406/1674 4.67 3.87 4.27 4.42 4.	.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 379/1674 4.67 3.76 4.23 4.31 4.	.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $1$ $2$ $4.67$ $376/1423$ $4.67$ $3.53$ $4.27$ $4.34$ $4.$	.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $1$ $2$ $4.67$ $312/1609$ $4.67$ $3.67$ $4.22$ $4.30$ $4.$	.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 224/1585 4.67 3.69 3.96 4.01 4.	.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 $4.67$ 238/1535 $4.67$ 3.77 $4.08$ $4.18$ $4.$	.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1651 5.00 3.82 4.18 4.23 5.	.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 1566/1673 4.00 4.89 4.69 4.67 4.	.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 $4.67$ $257/1656$ $4.67$ $3.66$ $4.07$ $4.19$ $4.$	.67
Lecture	
	.67
	5.00
	.67
	.67
	.67
	,
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 810/1520 4.00 3.40 4.01 4.18 4.	.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 629/1515 4.50 3.53 4.24 4.40 4.	.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1511 5.00 3.57 4.27 4.45 5.	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 732/994 3.50 3.46 3.94 4.19 3.	.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L L	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.00	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	Ő	0	0	1	0	0	0		1493/1515	2.00	3.53	4.24	4.40	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	Ő	0	0	1	0	0	0		1495/1511	2.00	3.57	4.27	4.45	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	988/ 994	1.00	3.46	3.94	4.19	1.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	1	5	4.57	521/1674	4.57	3.87	4.27	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	705/1674	4.43	3.76	4.23	4.34	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1423	4.43	3.53	4.27	4.28	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	614/1609	4.43	3.67	4.22	4.34	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	530/1585	4.29	3.69	3.96	4.23	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.77	4.08	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	432/1651	4.57	3.82	4.18	4.32	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.25	3.66	4.07	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.17	4.43	4.50	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.30	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1043/1582	4.14	3.81	4.26	4.33	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	612/1575	4.57	3.70	4.27	4.30	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.62	3.94	3.85	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	Ο	0	2	0	1	3 67	1092/1520	3.67	3.40	4.01	4.19	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	2		1024/1515	4.00	3.53	4.24	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1		1050/1511	4.00	3.55	4.27	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 994		3.46	3.94	4.07	****
1. Here Spectral Committant Successful	-	2	5	5	5	5	-	5.00	, ,, ,,		5.10	5.71	1.07	

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