

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 191  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	8	16	19	3.88	1228/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	15	23	4.12	992/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	5	20	19	4.17	838/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	2	1	7	13	9	3.81	1159/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	14	2	2	6	11	13	3.91	921/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	2	6	5	6	3.79	1030/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	1	0	9	11	25	4.28	728/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	1	5	39	4.76	832/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	2	3	19	9	3.97	892/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	3	8	34	4.48	839/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	2	2	7	35	4.48	1178/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	3	12	29	4.31	830/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	4	12	25	4.15	967/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	1	6	13	19	4.12	598/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	2	13	8	14	3.57	1021/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	6	17	16	4.02	898/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	10	11	15	3.76	1067/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	3	7	9	18	4.14	400/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 191  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	4	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 192  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	8	16	19	3.88	1228/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	15	23	4.12	992/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	5	20	19	4.17	838/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	2	1	7	13	9	3.81	1159/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	14	2	2	6	11	13	3.91	921/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	2	6	5	6	3.79	1030/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	1	0	9	11	25	4.28	728/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	1	5	39	4.76	832/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	1	1	9	11	1	3.43	1278/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	3	2	4	3	17	4.00	1203/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	3	2	3	6	18	4.06	1336/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	4	3	4	2	13	3.65	1239/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	2	3	3	4	3	13	3.77	1188/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	5	2	2	7	6	6	3.52	974/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	2	13	8	14	3.57	1021/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	6	17	16	4.02	898/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	10	11	15	3.76	1067/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	3	7	9	18	4.14	400/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 192  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	4	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 193  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	4	8	16	19	3.88	1228/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	15	23	4.12	992/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	5	20	19	4.17	838/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	2	1	7	13	9	3.81	1159/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	14	2	2	6	11	13	3.91	921/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	2	6	5	6	3.79	1030/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	1	0	9	11	25	4.28	728/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	1	5	39	4.76	832/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	1	0	0	6	8	5	3.95	931/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	981/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	1257/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	902/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	919/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	2	0	2	6	2	7	3.82	814/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	2	13	8	14	3.57	1021/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	6	17	16	4.02	898/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	10	11	15	3.76	1067/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	3	7	9	18	4.14	400/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 193  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	4	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Skerker,Rachel (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 194  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	8	16	19	3.88	1228/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	15	23	4.12	992/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	5	20	19	4.17	838/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	2	1	7	13	9	3.81	1159/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	14	2	2	6	11	13	3.91	921/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	2	6	5	6	3.79	1030/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	1	0	9	11	25	4.28	728/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	1	5	39	4.76	832/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	2	0	1	7	7	2	3.59	1213/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	981/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	1312/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	1051/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	881/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	2	0	2	5	2	8	3.94	730/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	2	13	8	14	3.57	1021/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	6	17	16	4.02	898/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	10	11	15	3.76	1067/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	3	7	9	18	4.14	400/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Skerker,Rachel (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 194  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	4	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 195  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	12	9	3.71	1321/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1351/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	8	9	9	5	3.15	1239/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	3	9	12	5	3.41	1342/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	11	5	10	3.63	1122/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	7	8	6	3.74	1063/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	6	12	12	3.86	1141/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	858/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	2	11	10	1	3.42	1289/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	10	20	4.38	950/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	6	24	4.53	1146/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	5	14	12	4.03	1040/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	13	12	3.94	1098/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	2	10	9	9	3.66	909/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	8	14	8	3.84	892/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	10	12	3.88	1005/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	10	10	8	3.71	1087/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	1	7	9	12	3.81	580/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	186/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 195  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 196  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	12	9	3.71	1321/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1351/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	8	9	9	5	3.15	1239/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	3	9	12	5	3.41	1342/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	11	5	10	3.63	1122/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	7	8	6	3.74	1063/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	6	12	12	3.86	1141/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	858/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	1	7	10	2	3.52	1234/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	2	2	8	11	4.22	1102/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	3	11	9	4.26	1289/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	2	7	8	6	3.78	1194/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	4	8	8	3.83	1168/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	5	3	5	6	3.63	920/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	8	14	8	3.84	892/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	10	12	3.88	1005/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	10	10	8	3.71	1087/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	1	7	9	12	3.81	580/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	186/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 196  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 197  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	12	9	3.71	1321/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1351/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	8	9	9	5	3.15	1239/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	3	9	12	5	3.41	1342/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	11	5	10	3.63	1122/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	7	8	6	3.74	1063/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	6	12	12	3.86	1141/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	858/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	3	5	6	3	2	2.79	1424/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	3	1	3	6	8	3.71	1330/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	2	1	6	6	8	3.74	1380/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	5	3	7	1	5	2.90	1379/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	2	3	1	4	7	4	3.42	1288/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	7	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	945/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	8	14	8	3.84	892/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	10	12	3.88	1005/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	10	10	8	3.71	1087/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	1	7	9	12	3.81	580/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	186/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 197  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 198  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	12	9	3.71	1321/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1351/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	8	9	9	5	3.15	1239/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	3	9	12	5	3.41	1342/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	11	5	10	3.63	1122/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	7	8	6	3.74	1063/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	6	12	12	3.86	1141/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	858/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	489/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	2	1	1	8	8	3.95	1235/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	1	11	9	4.27	1285/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	1000/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	3	10	4	3.65	1223/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	6	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	804/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	8	14	8	3.84	892/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	10	12	3.88	1005/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	10	10	8	3.71	1087/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	1	7	9	12	3.81	580/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	186/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Wassink, Sarah (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 198  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 12  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 199  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	10	12	4.22	911/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	11	9	4.07	1034/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	3	12	3.85	1047/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	3	2	7	5	3.40	1342/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	739/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1009/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	7	9	3.84	1148/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	23	4.84	702/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	3	3	6	7	3.75	1101/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	531/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	22	4.70	968/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	3	16	4.22	911/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	7	12	4.04	1033/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	4	9	10	4.04	644/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	11	9	3.96	795/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	12	11	4.23	796/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	3	8	10	3.85	1037/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	1	6	9	7	3.72	625/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 12  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 199  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 12  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 200  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	10	12	4.22	911/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	11	9	4.07	1034/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	3	12	3.85	1047/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	3	2	7	5	3.40	1342/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	739/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1009/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	7	9	3.84	1148/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	23	4.84	702/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	10	7	3	3.65	1174/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	852/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	1217/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1051/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1115/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	969/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	11	9	3.96	795/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	12	11	4.23	796/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	3	8	10	3.85	1037/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	1	6	9	7	3.72	625/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 12  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 200  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 12  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 201  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	10	12	4.22	911/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	11	9	4.07	1034/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	3	12	3.85	1047/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	3	2	7	5	3.40	1342/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	739/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1009/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	7	9	3.84	1148/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	23	4.84	702/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	3	8	8	0	3.15	1367/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	1308/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	1332/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1187/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1163/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	11	9	3.96	795/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	12	11	4.23	796/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	3	8	10	3.85	1037/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	1	6	9	7	3.72	625/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 12  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 201  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 12  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 202  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	10	12	4.22	911/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	11	9	4.07	1034/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	3	12	3.85	1047/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	3	2	7	5	3.40	1342/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	739/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1009/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	7	9	3.84	1148/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	23	4.84	702/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	15	1	3.80	1060/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1203/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	1189/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	617/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	947/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	11	9	3.96	795/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	12	11	4.23	796/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	3	8	10	3.85	1037/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	1	6	9	7	3.72	625/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 12  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Wassink, Sarah (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 202  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	28	21	4.11	1032/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	12	23	21	4.02	1078/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	3	15	17	20	3.83	1064/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	4	9	16	13	3.84	1143/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	3	4	14	10	16	3.68	1093/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	2	6	6	7	9	3.50	1192/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	4	13	17	22	3.96	1034/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	11	44	4.75	845/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	2	10	27	6	3.82	1044/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	15	40	4.51	800/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	7	48	4.72	950/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	10	18	28	4.22	911/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	5	6	13	31	4.27	881/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	4	6	19	23	4.06	640/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	5	20	20	4.12	701/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	4	8	13	24	4.16	839/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	4	10	11	21	3.88	1025/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	3	5	9	24	4.24	344/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors		42	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	20							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General		3	Under-grad	61	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 101 13  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 204  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	28	21	4.11	1032/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	12	23	21	4.02	1078/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	3	15	17	20	3.83	1064/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	4	9	16	13	3.84	1143/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	3	4	14	10	16	3.68	1093/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	2	6	6	7	9	3.50	1192/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	4	13	17	22	3.96	1034/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	11	44	4.75	845/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	1	2	9	20	1	3.55	1227/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	2	0	3	12	21	4.32	1021/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	1	4	6	28	4.47	1178/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	2	3	11	15	4.16	964/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	2	10	18	4.45	696/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	3	1	1	2	11	13	4.21	520/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	5	20	20	4.12	701/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	4	8	13	24	4.16	839/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	4	10	11	21	3.88	1025/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	3	5	9	24	4.24	344/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors		42	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	20							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General		3	Under-grad	61	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 101 13  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Juodeska,Rokas (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 205  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	28	21	4.11	1032/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	12	23	21	4.02	1078/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	3	15	17	20	3.83	1064/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	4	9	16	13	3.84	1143/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	3	4	14	10	16	3.68	1093/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	2	6	6	7	9	3.50	1192/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	4	13	17	22	3.96	1034/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	11	44	4.75	845/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	4	0	0	16	12	1	3.48	1251/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	4	1	6	3	16	3.87	1279/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	2	5	9	19	4.19	1312/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	3	0	8	4	13	3.86	1166/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	36	3	1	1	2	6	12	4.23	919/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	9	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	789/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	5	20	20	4.12	701/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	4	8	13	24	4.16	839/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	4	10	11	21	3.88	1025/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	3	5	9	24	4.24	344/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				
-----											
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	3	Under-grad	61	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 13  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 206  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	28	21	4.11	1032/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	12	23	21	4.02	1078/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	3	15	17	20	3.83	1064/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	4	9	16	13	3.84	1143/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	3	4	14	10	16	3.68	1093/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	2	6	6	7	9	3.50	1192/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	4	13	17	22	3.96	1034/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	11	44	4.75	845/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	4	0	0	11	13	5	3.79	1068/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	4	0	6	4	16	3.93	1248/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	0	6	10	18	4.26	1292/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	1	0	9	4	14	4.07	1015/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	2	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	881/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	8	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	664/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	5	20	20	4.12	701/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	4	8	13	24	4.16	839/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	4	10	11	21	3.88	1025/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	3	5	9	24	4.24	344/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	42
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 20		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 14	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 61
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 207  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	10	15	3.84	1258/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	13	10	12	3.76	1252/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	14	8	3.58	1140/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	5	8	7	6	3.36	1360/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	4	6	7	10	3.48	1189/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	779/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	7	21	4.05	951/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	662/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	11	12	4	3.68	1161/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	12	19	4.36	970/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	7	24	4.44	1195/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	6	11	15	4.03	1040/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	6	12	14	4.03	1037/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	3	6	8	14	3.97	708/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	13	10	5	3.44	1077/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	7	5	14	3.81	1037/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	5	8	6	9	3.42	1167/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	7	11	11	4.00	442/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 207  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 208  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	10	15	3.84	1258/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	13	10	12	3.76	1252/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	14	8	3.58	1140/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	5	8	7	6	3.36	1360/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	4	6	7	10	3.48	1189/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	779/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	7	21	4.05	951/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	662/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	1	1	7	11	1	3.48	1257/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	1021/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	0	0	3	17	4.67	1014/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	964/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	1098/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	4	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	607/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	13	10	5	3.44	1077/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	7	5	14	3.81	1037/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	5	8	6	9	3.42	1167/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	7	11	11	4.00	442/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 208  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 14  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Juodeska,Rokas (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 209  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	10	15	3.84	1258/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	13	10	12	3.76	1252/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	14	8	3.58	1140/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	5	8	7	6	3.36	1360/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	4	6	7	10	3.48	1189/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	779/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	7	21	4.05	951/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	662/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	0	5	7	7	3.95	918/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	447/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	614/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	876/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1010/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	****/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	13	10	5	3.44	1077/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	7	5	14	3.81	1037/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	5	8	6	9	3.42	1167/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	7	11	11	4.00	442/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Juodeska,Rokas (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 209  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 210  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	10	15	3.84	1258/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	13	10	12	3.76	1252/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	14	8	3.58	1140/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	5	8	7	6	3.36	1360/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	4	6	7	10	3.48	1189/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	779/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	7	21	4.05	951/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	662/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	786/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	588/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	639/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	496/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1010/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	****/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	13	10	5	3.44	1077/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	7	5	14	3.81	1037/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	5	8	6	9	3.42	1167/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	7	11	11	4.00	442/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 210  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 3  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 211  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	18	4.20	942/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	17	4.23	891/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	20	4.20	826/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	737/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	5	5	14	4.28	551/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	899/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	1	4	24	4.53	422/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	3	29	4.79	807/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	8	13	6	3.93	957/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	6	24	4.58	712/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	0	4	28	4.68	1002/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	2	5	22	4.30	841/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	3	2	24	4.41	758/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	4	3	2	2	19	3.97	708/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	0	4	7	16	4.00	746/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	0	2	7	19	4.26	783/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	7	10	13	4.10	904/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	1	6	1	17	4.23	344/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	1
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 3  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 212  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	18	4.20	942/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	17	4.23	891/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	20	4.20	826/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	737/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	5	5	14	4.28	551/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	899/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	1	4	24	4.53	422/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	3	29	4.79	807/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	0	7	9	1	3.65	1181/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1203/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	1211/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1116/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	6	8	4.13	987/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	451/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	0	4	7	16	4.00	746/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	0	2	7	19	4.26	783/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	7	10	13	4.10	904/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	1	6	1	17	4.23	344/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	1
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 3  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Juodeska,Rokas (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 213  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	18	4.20	942/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	17	4.23	891/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	20	4.20	826/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	737/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	5	5	14	4.28	551/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	899/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	1	4	24	4.53	422/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	3	29	4.79	807/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	2	7	7	1	3.41	1289/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1371/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1333/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	841/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1047/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	0	4	7	16	4.00	746/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	0	2	7	19	4.26	783/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	7	10	13	4.10	904/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	1	6	1	17	4.23	344/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	1
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 3  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Skerker,Rachel (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 214  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	18	4.20	942/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	17	4.23	891/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	20	4.20	826/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	737/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	5	5	14	4.28	551/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	899/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	1	4	24	4.53	422/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	3	29	4.79	807/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	2	3	7	4	1	2.94	1402/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1334/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1396/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1256/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	2	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	1185/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	0	4	7	16	4.00	746/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	0	2	7	19	4.26	783/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	7	10	13	4.10	904/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	1	6	1	17	4.23	344/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Under-grad	35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	1
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	



Course-Section: CHEM 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 215  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	8	27	20	4.05	1079/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	12	20	26	4.20	912/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	10	17	27	4.12	869/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	2	1	4	16	16	4.10	911/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	1	1	9	11	22	4.18	665/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	27	0	2	6	7	13	4.11	751/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	4	7	9	35	4.36	641/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	4	51	4.93	466/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	2	2	10	22	11	3.81	1060/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	8	46	4.74	480/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	54	4.93	429/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	11	39	4.54	568/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	14	37	4.54	596/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	2	7	10	28	4.29	458/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	6	0	9	11	23	3.92	856/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	3	4	10	27	4.10	874/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	5	2	10	11	20	3.81	1049/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	5	1	6	10	25	4.04	432/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.04
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 215  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 216  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	8	27	20	4.05	1079/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	12	20	26	4.20	912/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	10	17	27	4.12	869/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	2	1	4	16	16	4.10	911/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	1	1	9	11	22	4.18	665/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	27	0	2	6	7	13	4.11	751/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	4	7	9	35	4.36	641/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	4	51	4.93	466/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	3	3	12	18	4	3.42	1284/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	3	6	29	4.62	660/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	2	1	8	31	4.62	1072/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	3	0	5	13	19	4.13	985/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	2	0	4	12	19	4.24	904/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	9	2	1	5	5	14	4.04	649/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	6	0	9	11	23	3.92	856/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	3	4	10	27	4.10	874/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	5	2	10	11	20	3.81	1049/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	5	1	6	10	25	4.04	432/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.04
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 216  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 217  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	8	27	20	4.05	1079/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	12	20	26	4.20	912/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	10	17	27	4.12	869/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	2	1	4	16	16	4.10	911/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	1	1	9	11	22	4.18	665/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	27	0	2	6	7	13	4.11	751/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	4	7	9	35	4.36	641/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	4	51	4.93	466/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	6	1	7	16	5	3.37	1303/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	2	2	3	4	15	4.08	1182/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	2	0	5	8	14	4.10	1331/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	7	0	2	7	11	3.56	1266/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	2	3	1	7	10	3.87	1150/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	37	11	4	0	3	0	4	3.00	****/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	6	0	9	11	23	3.92	856/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	3	4	10	27	4.10	874/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	5	2	10	11	20	3.81	1049/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	5	1	6	10	25	4.04	432/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.04
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 217  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Polasani,Shivan (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 218  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	8	27	20	4.05	1079/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	12	20	26	4.20	912/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	10	17	27	4.12	869/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	2	1	4	16	16	4.10	911/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	1	1	9	11	22	4.18	665/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	27	0	2	6	7	13	4.11	751/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	4	7	9	35	4.36	641/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	4	51	4.93	466/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	1	0	6	21	7	3.94	931/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	1	1	3	5	16	4.31	1032/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	5	9	15	4.34	1251/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	2	0	3	9	12	4.12	992/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	1010/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	37	11	2	0	3	0	6	3.73	****/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	6	0	9	11	23	3.92	856/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	3	4	10	27	4.10	874/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	5	2	10	11	20	3.81	1049/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	5	1	6	10	25	4.04	432/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.04
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Polasani,Shivan (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 218  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 219  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	5	9	16	24	3.93	1194/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	23	22	4.11	1013/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	11	16	24	3.98	943/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	3	3	9	11	16	3.81	1167/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	3	9	10	20	4.05	783/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	2	10	6	13	3.97	859/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	10	12	26	4.02	979/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	53	4.96	233/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	6	22	16	4.16	738/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	3	10	39	4.62	646/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	0	2	9	40	4.60	1084/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	6	13	29	4.31	830/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	10	8	32	4.37	788/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	3	0	8	9	24	4.16	572/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	3	11	9	17	3.73	952/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	4	8	28	4.24	789/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	4	4	8	9	18	3.77	1067/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	6	2	8	4	19	3.72	630/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 219  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 220  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	5	9	16	24	3.93	1194/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	23	22	4.11	1013/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	11	16	24	3.98	943/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	3	3	9	11	16	3.81	1167/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	3	9	10	20	4.05	783/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	2	10	6	13	3.97	859/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	10	12	26	4.02	979/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	53	4.96	233/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	1	18	13	6	3.63	1187/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	1	9	5	18	4.21	1102/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	1	7	6	24	4.39	1222/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	4	6	8	14	4.00	1051/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	6	7	7	8	3.35	1303/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	8	2	1	7	7	9	3.77	847/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	3	11	9	17	3.73	952/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	4	8	28	4.24	789/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	4	4	8	9	18	3.77	1067/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	6	2	8	4	19	3.72	630/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 220  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 221  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	9	16	24	3.93	1194/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	23	22	4.11	1013/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	11	16	24	3.98	943/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	3	3	9	11	16	3.81	1167/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	3	9	10	20	4.05	783/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	2	10	6	13	3.97	859/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	10	12	26	4.02	979/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	53	4.96	233/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	1	12	18	4	3.71	1133/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	1128/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	2	7	7	17	4.18	1314/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	1	1	5	5	11	4.04	1030/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	2	8	3	10	3.91	1123/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	8	1	3	5	2	5	3.44	1016/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	3	11	9	17	3.73	952/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	4	8	28	4.24	789/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	4	4	8	9	18	3.77	1067/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	6	2	8	4	19	3.72	630/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 221  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Polasani,Shivan (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 222  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	5	9	16	24	3.93	1194/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	23	22	4.11	1013/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	11	16	24	3.98	943/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	3	3	9	11	16	3.81	1167/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	3	9	10	20	4.05	783/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	2	10	6	13	3.97	859/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	10	12	26	4.02	979/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	53	4.96	233/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	4	1	1	10	14	6	3.72	1133/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	1	0	5	6	11	4.13	1154/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	1	1	8	7	16	4.09	1332/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	2	0	5	5	10	3.95	1098/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	3	6	3	10	3.91	1132/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	9	1	2	5	2	5	3.53	969/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	3	11	9	17	3.73	952/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	4	8	28	4.24	789/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	4	4	8	9	18	3.77	1067/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	6	2	8	4	19	3.72	630/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.72
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Polasani,Shivan (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 222  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 101 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 223  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	8	13	18	3.89	1221/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	8	13	19	3.98	1109/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	8	14	21	4.23	803/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	6	7	13	9	3.71	1212/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	9	13	17	4.10	746/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	14	0	4	8	7	10	3.79	1023/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	9	11	21	4.19	833/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	3	3	35	4.78	807/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	0	4	18	7	4.10	799/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	6	32	4.79	379/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	36	4.88	614/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	9	27	4.66	429/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	1	4	6	28	4.56	577/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	0	5	9	19	4.42	338/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	8	8	14	3.94	832/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	7	4	20	4.34	715/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	7	9	13	3.94	988/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	6	6	16	4.28	322/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.28
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A 14	Required for Majors 24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B 6	General 2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 10	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 47
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1	Non-major 45
Electives 2					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	1			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 224  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	8	13	18	3.89	1221/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	8	13	19	3.98	1109/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	8	14	21	4.23	803/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	6	7	13	9	3.71	1212/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	9	13	17	4.10	746/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	14	0	4	8	7	10	3.79	1023/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	9	11	21	4.19	833/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	3	3	35	4.78	807/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	1	5	22	2	3.83	1036/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	447/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	950/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	641/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	8	17	4.43	733/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	0	0	6	4	15	4.36	392/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	8	8	14	3.94	832/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	7	4	20	4.34	715/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	7	9	13	3.94	988/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	6	6	16	4.28	322/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.28
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A 14	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B 6	General 2	Under-grad 47	Non-major 45
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 10			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	8	13	18	3.89	1221/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	8	13	19	3.98	1109/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	8	14	21	4.23	803/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	6	7	13	9	3.71	1212/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	9	13	17	4.10	746/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	14	0	4	8	7	10	3.79	1023/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	9	11	21	4.19	833/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	3	3	35	4.78	807/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	0	8	13	4	3.73	1117/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	865/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	1278/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	779/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	6	3	12	4.29	874/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	5	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	635/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	8	8	14	3.94	832/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	7	4	20	4.34	715/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	7	9	13	3.94	988/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	6	6	16	4.28	322/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.28
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A 14	Required for Majors 24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B 6	General 2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 10	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 47
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1	Non-major 45
Electives 2					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	1			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 226  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	8	13	18	3.89	1221/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	8	13	19	3.98	1109/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	8	14	21	4.23	803/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	6	7	13	9	3.71	1212/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	9	13	17	4.10	746/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	14	0	4	8	7	10	3.79	1023/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	9	11	21	4.19	833/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	3	3	35	4.78	807/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	3	0	1	7	14	3	3.76	1092/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	865/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	1060/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	617/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	874/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	5	0	0	6	4	5	3.93	741/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	8	8	14	3.94	832/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	7	4	20	4.34	715/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	7	9	13	3.94	988/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	6	6	16	4.28	322/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.28
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A 14	Required for Majors 24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B 6	General 2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 10	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 47
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1	Non-major 45
Electives 2					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	1			



Course-Section: CHEM 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 227  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	9	20	21	3.98	1134/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	15	26	4.11	1013/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	4	10	12	25	3.96	962/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	4	4	14	17	4.05	945/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	3	4	5	17	15	3.84	979/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	6	5	9	9	3.55	1173/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	9	16	24	4.04	965/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	3	3	3	44	4.66	941/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	2	2	8	13	10	3.77	1084/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	3	2	7	38	4.53	775/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	1	9	39	4.65	1037/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	4	8	36	4.46	665/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	2	2	3	11	32	4.38	778/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	3	2	2	8	27	4.29	466/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	5	10	8	18	3.63	996/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	2	9	10	22	4.00	904/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	5	2	12	7	17	3.67	1098/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	3	0	5	10	18	4.11	411/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 227  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 228  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	9	20	21	3.98	1134/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	15	26	4.11	1013/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	4	10	12	25	3.96	962/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	4	4	14	17	4.05	945/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	3	4	5	17	15	3.84	979/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	6	5	9	9	3.55	1173/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	9	16	24	4.04	965/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	3	3	3	44	4.66	941/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	2	2	2	8	15	3	3.50	1241/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	4	3	9	20	4.25	1071/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	2	4	8	21	4.37	1234/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	1	2	7	8	18	4.11	992/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	4	5	2	13	13	3.70	1206/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	5	3	5	4	14	3.61	930/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	5	10	8	18	3.63	996/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	2	9	10	22	4.00	904/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	5	2	12	7	17	3.67	1098/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	3	0	5	10	18	4.11	411/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 228  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 229  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	9	20	21	3.98	1134/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	15	26	4.11	1013/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	4	10	12	25	3.96	962/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	4	4	14	17	4.05	945/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	3	4	5	17	15	3.84	979/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	6	5	9	9	3.55	1173/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	9	16	24	4.04	965/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	3	3	3	44	4.66	941/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	2	1	8	9	9	2	3.10	1381/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	2	1	2	8	13	4.12	1166/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	3	3	7	15	4.21	1306/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	1	3	2	7	13	4.08	1015/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	4	4	2	11	7	3.46	1276/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	10	2	3	2	4	6	3.53	974/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	5	10	8	18	3.63	996/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	2	9	10	22	4.00	904/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	5	2	12	7	17	3.67	1098/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	3	0	5	10	18	4.11	411/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Manning, Steve (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 229  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Polasani,Shivan (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 230  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	9	20	21	3.98	1134/1509	3.98	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	15	26	4.11	1013/1509	4.02	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	4	10	12	25	3.96	962/1287	3.91	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	4	4	14	17	4.05	945/1459	3.78	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	3	4	5	17	15	3.84	979/1406	3.93	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	6	5	9	9	3.55	1173/1384	3.82	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	9	16	24	4.04	965/1489	4.11	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	3	3	3	44	4.66	941/1506	4.81	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	3	0	1	10	13	4	3.71	1133/1463	3.66	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	1	1	4	5	15	4.23	1086/1438	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	6	4	17	4.41	1217/1421	4.40	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	2	3	3	4	15	4.00	1051/1411	4.11	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	4	6	7	9	3.61	1241/1405	4.05	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	10	2	1	2	3	9	3.94	730/1236	3.92	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	5	10	8	18	3.63	996/1260	3.82	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	2	9	10	22	4.00	904/1255	4.10	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	5	2	12	7	17	3.67	1098/1258	3.79	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	3	0	5	10	18	4.11	411/ 873	4.03	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 198	3.44	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 7  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Polasani,Shivan (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 230  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 101H 4  
 Title Prin Of Chem I - Honor  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 231  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	1369/1509	3.87	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	543/1509	4.54	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	590/1287	4.65	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	979/1459	4.33	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1105/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1107/1384	3.58	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	458/1489	4.46	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.94	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	235/1463	3.68	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.33	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1411	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	987/1405	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	383/1236	3.38	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	904/1255	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1205/1258	3.86	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.17	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 4  
 Title Prin Of Chem I - Honor  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 232  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	1369/1509	3.87	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	543/1509	4.54	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	590/1287	4.65	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	979/1459	4.33	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1105/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1107/1384	3.58	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	458/1489	4.46	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.94	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1217/1463	3.68	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1160/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1345/1421	4.33	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1204/1411	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1372/1405	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	936/1236	3.38	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	904/1255	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1205/1258	3.86	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.17	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 4  
 Title Prin Of Chem I - Honor  
 Instructor: Juodeska,Rokas (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 233  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	1369/1509	3.87	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	543/1509	4.54	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	590/1287	4.65	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	979/1459	4.33	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1105/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1107/1384	3.58	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	458/1489	4.46	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.94	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1463	3.68	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1345/1421	4.33	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	885/1411	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1405	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1209/1236	3.38	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	904/1255	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1205/1258	3.86	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.17	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 4  
 Title Prin Of Chem I - Honor  
 Instructor: Skerker,Rachel (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 234  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	1369/1509	3.87	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	543/1509	4.54	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	590/1287	4.65	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	979/1459	4.33	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1105/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1107/1384	3.58	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	458/1489	4.46	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.94	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1329/1463	3.68	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1376/1421	4.33	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	885/1411	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1405	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1188/1236	3.38	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	904/1255	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1205/1258	3.86	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.17	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 8  
 Title Prin Of Chem I - Honor  
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 235  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	998/1509	3.87	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	459/1509	4.54	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.65	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.33	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1192/1384	3.58	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	569/1489	4.46	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.78	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	598/1463	3.68	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	4.33	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1411	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	393/1405	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	950/1236	3.38	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	443/1255	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	620/1258	3.86	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	754/ 873	3.17	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 8  
 Title Prin Of Chem I - Honor  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 236  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	998/1509	3.87	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	459/1509	4.54	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.65	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.33	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1192/1384	3.58	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	569/1489	4.46	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.78	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1314/1463	3.68	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1001/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1292/1421	4.33	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	810/1411	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	984/1236	3.38	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	443/1255	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	620/1258	3.86	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	754/ 873	3.17	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 8  
 Title Prin Of Chem I - Honor  
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 237  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	998/1509	3.87	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	459/1509	4.54	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.65	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.33	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1192/1384	3.58	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	569/1489	4.46	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.78	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1295/1463	3.68	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1257/1421	4.33	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	617/1411	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1047/1405	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	984/1236	3.38	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	443/1255	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	620/1258	3.86	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	754/ 873	3.17	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 8  
 Title Prin Of Chem I - Honor  
 Instructor: Skerker,Rachel (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 238  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	998/1509	3.87	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	459/1509	4.54	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.65	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.33	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1192/1384	3.58	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	569/1489	4.46	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.78	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1354/1463	3.68	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1257/1421	4.33	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	617/1411	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1047/1405	4.12	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	984/1236	3.38	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1226/1260	2.67	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	443/1255	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	620/1258	3.86	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	754/ 873	3.17	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 102 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 239  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	15	14	14	3.66	1340/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	18	17	9	3.56	1347/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	13	13	10	9	3.19	1232/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	4	11	8	2	2.81	1449/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	2.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	9	13	15	3.79	1016/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	5	1	6	2	3	2.82	1351/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	11	20	13	3.83	1155/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	2	1	36	8	4.06	1360/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	3	9	13	13	3.87	1006/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	6	17	24	4.29	1047/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	6	39	4.69	979/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	5	8	11	25	4.14	971/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	17	21	4.08	1010/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	17	5	3	5	6	10	3.45	1012/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	9	4	10	8	8	3.05	1155/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	5	11	7	14	3.67	1084/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	4	13	7	11	3.44	1161/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	6	2	5	8	13	3.59	677/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	General 0	Under-grad 50	Non-major 47
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 13			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 1			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	15	14	14	3.66	1340/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	18	17	9	3.56	1347/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	13	13	10	9	3.19	1232/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	4	11	8	2	2.81	1449/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	2.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	9	13	15	3.79	1016/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	5	1	6	2	3	2.82	1351/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	11	20	13	3.83	1155/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	2	1	36	8	4.06	1360/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	3	8	15	9	1	2.92	1408/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	6	6	8	15	3.91	1261/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	4	6	9	18	4.11	1331/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	8	8	6	11	3.53	1272/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	7	2	9	7	8	3.21	1328/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	4	6	2	8	4	7	3.15	1104/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	9	4	10	8	8	3.05	1155/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	5	11	7	14	3.67	1084/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	4	13	7	11	3.44	1161/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	6	2	5	8	13	3.59	677/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	General 0	Under-grad 50	Non-major 47
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 13			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 1			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Skerker,Rachel (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 241  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	15	14	14	3.66	1340/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	18	17	9	3.56	1347/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	13	13	10	9	3.19	1232/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	4	11	8	2	2.81	1449/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	2.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	9	13	15	3.79	1016/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	5	1	6	2	3	2.82	1351/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	11	20	13	3.83	1155/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	2	1	36	8	4.06	1360/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	3	6	3	12	10	1	2.91	1410/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	2	4	12	3	8	3.38	1384/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	4	4	10	1	14	3.52	1395/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	6	4	9	6	5	3.00	1361/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	6	6	4	5	6	2.96	1356/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	6	4	4	6	4	3	2.90	1164/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	9	4	10	8	8	3.05	1155/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	5	11	7	14	3.67	1084/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	4	13	7	11	3.44	1161/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	6	2	5	8	13	3.59	677/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	General 0	Under-grad 50	Non-major 47
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 13			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 1			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 4  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 242  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	15	14	14	3.66	1340/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	18	17	9	3.56	1347/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	13	13	10	9	3.19	1232/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	4	11	8	2	2.81	1449/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	2.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	9	13	15	3.79	1016/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	5	1	6	2	3	2.82	1351/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	11	20	13	3.83	1155/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	2	1	36	8	4.06	1360/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	3	2	0	5	12	12	4.03	836/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	1	7	7	14	4.17	1128/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	3	3	26	4.64	1049/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	2	2	6	20	4.47	665/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	3	3	5	14	3.96	1081/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	5	2	4	7	3	7	3.39	1034/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	9	4	10	8	8	3.05	1155/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	5	11	7	14	3.67	1084/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	4	13	7	11	3.44	1161/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	6	2	5	8	13	3.59	677/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	General 0	Under-grad 50	Non-major 47
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 13			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 1			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 243  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	3	9	23	13	3.73	1311/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	13	19	15	3.81	1228/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	6	11	24	8	3.59	1140/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	4	1	4	10	9	3.68	1233/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	3	4	18	21	4.17	674/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	3	2	8	4	3	3.10	1313/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	11	20	18	4.00	986/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	35	15	4.30	1222/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	9	23	10	4.02	842/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	9	37	4.57	725/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	8	42	4.72	950/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	8	16	26	4.27	876/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	5	18	25	4.32	838/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	22	3	3	6	7	9	3.57	950/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	14	5	8	12	5	2.75	1212/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	14	7	17	3.70	1071/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	8	4	11	11	10	3.25	1199/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	9	3	13	6	8	3.03	799/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 39	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 16	General 1	Under-grad 54 Non-major 54
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 10	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0	Electives 0 Other 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 244  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	3	9	23	13	3.73	1311/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	13	19	15	3.81	1228/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	6	11	24	8	3.59	1140/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	4	1	4	10	9	3.68	1233/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	3	4	18	21	4.17	674/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	3	2	8	4	3	3.10	1313/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	11	20	18	4.00	986/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	35	15	4.30	1222/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	6	4	18	9	0	2.81	1421/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	4	1	7	6	12	3.70	1334/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	5	2	8	5	13	3.58	1393/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	8	3	7	5	6	2.93	1373/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	3	5	4	9	2	7	3.07	1343/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	3	8	1	7	5	6	3.00	1131/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	14	5	8	12	5	2.75	1212/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	14	7	17	3.70	1071/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	8	4	11	11	10	3.25	1199/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	9	3	13	6	8	3.03	799/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	39	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 17				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 16	General	1	Under-grad 54	Non-major 54
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 10	D 2				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	0		
			? 0				

Course-Section: CHEM 102 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Polasani,Shivan (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 245  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	3	9	23	13	3.73	1311/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	13	19	15	3.81	1228/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	6	11	24	8	3.59	1140/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	4	1	4	10	9	3.68	1233/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	3	4	18	21	4.17	674/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	3	2	8	4	3	3.10	1313/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	11	20	18	4.00	986/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	35	15	4.30	1222/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	4	2	2	8	10	6	3.57	1217/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	38	0	0	4	0	3	9	4.06	1185/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	34	0	3	1	4	4	8	3.65	1387/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	40	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	789/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	1098/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	38	7	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	****/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	14	5	8	12	5	2.75	1212/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	14	7	17	3.70	1071/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	8	4	11	11	10	3.25	1199/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	9	3	13	6	8	3.03	799/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 39	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 16	General 1	Under-grad 54 Non-major 54
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 10	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 5  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 246  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	3	9	23	13	3.73	1311/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	13	19	15	3.81	1228/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	6	11	24	8	3.59	1140/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	4	1	4	10	9	3.68	1233/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	3	4	18	21	4.17	674/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	3	2	8	4	3	3.10	1313/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	11	20	18	4.00	986/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	35	15	4.30	1222/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	4	0	2	10	10	7	3.76	1101/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	38	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	891/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	1	1	7	4	8	3.81	1376/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	40	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	713/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	1106/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	38	7	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	****/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	14	5	8	12	5	2.75	1212/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	14	7	17	3.70	1071/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	8	4	11	11	10	3.25	1199/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	9	3	13	6	8	3.03	799/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	39	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 17				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 16	General	1	Under-grad 54	Non-major 54
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 10	D 2				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	0		
			? 0				



Course-Section: CHEM 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 247  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	3	13	12	10	3.39	1428/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	16	13	9	3.56	1351/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	4	4	16	6	11	3.39	1190/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	5	10	9	9	3.51	1309/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	8	16	10	3.74	1052/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	4	3	3	7	7	3.42	1230/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	11	10	17	3.95	1046/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	1	25	13	4.31	1222/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	5	1	3	6	9	8	3.74	1109/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	2	9	27	4.40	930/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	35	4.81	794/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	3	5	10	20	4.00	1051/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	1	9	6	21	4.18	947/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	10	5	5	2	3	11	3.38	1038/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	0	7	9	3	3.30	1108/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	6	7	6	3.52	1122/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	1	3	10	6	3.65	1106/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	5	1	1	6	8	3.52	698/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.52
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 247  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	42
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 248  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	3	13	12	10	3.39	1428/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	16	13	9	3.56	1351/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	4	4	16	6	11	3.39	1190/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	5	10	9	9	3.51	1309/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	8	16	10	3.74	1052/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	4	3	3	7	7	3.42	1230/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	11	10	17	3.95	1046/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	1	25	13	4.31	1222/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	3	5	6	7	8	1	2.78	1425/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	5	2	5	6	14	3.69	1338/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	2	2	4	7	17	4.09	1332/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	3	4	6	6	12	3.65	1242/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	2	4	3	7	2	12	3.54	1257/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	5	3	6	1	11	3.38	1038/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	0	7	9	3	3.30	1108/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	6	7	6	3.52	1122/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	1	3	10	6	3.65	1106/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	5	1	1	6	8	3.52	698/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.52
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 248  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	42
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Skerker,Rachel (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 249  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	3	13	12	10	3.39	1428/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	16	13	9	3.56	1351/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	4	4	16	6	11	3.39	1190/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	5	10	9	9	3.51	1309/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	8	16	10	3.74	1052/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	4	3	3	7	7	3.42	1230/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	11	10	17	3.95	1046/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	1	25	13	4.31	1222/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	3	2	8	7	3	3.22	1350/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	5	1	7	2	11	3.50	1371/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	2	1	6	6	12	3.93	1363/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	2	3	6	5	10	3.69	1225/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	3	3	6	4	8	3.46	1279/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	3	6	1	3	1	7	3.11	1113/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	0	7	9	3	3.30	1108/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	6	7	6	3.52	1122/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	1	3	10	6	3.65	1106/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	5	1	1	6	8	3.52	698/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.52
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Skerker,Rachel (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 249  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	42
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 250  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	3	13	12	10	3.39	1428/1509	3.59	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	16	13	9	3.56	1351/1509	3.64	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	4	4	16	6	11	3.39	1190/1287	3.39	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	5	10	9	9	3.51	1309/1459	3.34	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	8	16	10	3.74	1052/1406	3.90	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	4	3	3	7	7	3.42	1230/1384	3.11	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	11	10	17	3.95	1046/1489	3.93	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	1	25	13	4.31	1222/1506	4.22	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	0	0	5	14	4	3.96	918/1463	3.47	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	2	0	6	4	14	4.08	1182/1438	4.02	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	5	6	15	4.38	1228/1421	4.16	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	2	4	7	11	4.00	1051/1411	3.87	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	2	7	3	10	3.95	1089/1405	3.72	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	5	4	0	4	0	8	3.50	984/1236	3.28	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	0	7	9	3	3.30	1108/1260	3.04	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	6	7	6	3.52	1122/1255	3.63	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	1	3	10	6	3.65	1106/1258	3.45	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	5	1	1	6	8	3.52	698/ 873	3.38	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.52
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 6  
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II  
 Instructor: Wassink, Sarah (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 250  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	42
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 10  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 251  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	10	7	4.05	1086/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	9	5	3.81	1228/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1113/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	5	6	6	3.70	1217/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	7	7	3.95	873/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	5	6	5	3.58	1159/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	1	4	6	5	3.47	1315/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	990/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	738/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	981/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1217/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	3.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	936/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	6	9	4.05	1024/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	3	1	4	3	2	3.00	1131/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	930/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	1014/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1110/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	585/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	102/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	123/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	141/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	135/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	157/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 7			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	1	
			? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 10  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Vavilala,Suma (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 252  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	10	7	4.05	1086/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	9	5	3.81	1228/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1113/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	5	6	6	3.70	1217/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	7	7	3.95	873/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	5	6	5	3.58	1159/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	1	4	6	5	3.47	1315/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	990/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1187/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1261/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	2	1	1	6	2	3.42	1400/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	3.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	1	6	3	1	3.00	1361/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	2	2	2	3	2	3.09	1341/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	930/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	1014/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1110/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	585/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	102/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	123/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	141/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	135/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	157/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 11  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 253  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1058/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	859/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	5	4	4.00	924/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1159/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	986/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	701/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	1	1	5	3.25	1374/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1006/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	853/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	1071/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1099/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	416/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	881/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	1	1	1	5	3.36	1045/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	762/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	878/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	650/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	135/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	3.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	86/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	171/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	3.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	87/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	117/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 11  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith, Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 253  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 11  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Peters,Hannah (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 254  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1058/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	859/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	5	4	4.00	924/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1159/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	986/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	701/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	1	1	5	3.25	1374/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1006/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	853/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	0	1	7	4.09	1176/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1389/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	0	1	7	4.09	1005/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1132/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	877/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	762/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	878/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	650/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	135/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	3.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	86/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	171/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	3.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	87/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	117/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 11  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Peters, Hannah (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 254  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 2  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 255  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1214/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	15	4	4.15	962/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	1000/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	894/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	400/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	10	3	3.94	899/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	3	8	3.80	1176/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	12	5	4.22	658/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	675/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	665/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	738/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	758/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1113/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	746/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	700/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	178/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	69/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	41/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	57/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	2	0	0	5	8	4.13	133/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	49/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 2  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Zhang,Hailiang (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 256  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1214/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	15	4	4.15	962/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	1000/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	894/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	400/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	10	3	3.94	899/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	3	8	3.80	1176/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	8	3	3.88	1006/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	660/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1275/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	758/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	605/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	746/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	700/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	178/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	69/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	41/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	57/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	2	0	0	5	8	4.13	133/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	49/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 3  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 257  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	7	4	3.35	1432/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	4	7	6	3.65	1310/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	0	3	6	3	3.57	1144/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	6	6	3.60	1271/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	1	4	9	4.00	813/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1222/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	9	5	3.65	1241/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	845/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	511/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	0	5	13	4.35	981/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	3	15	4.50	1162/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	1025/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	4	10	3.90	1132/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	1	3	4	5	3.44	1016/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	2	1	3	3.11	1146/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	1	0	0	6	3.78	1047/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	932/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	754/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	4	0	4	3	5	3.31	173/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	144/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	57/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	114/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	132/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.73
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 3  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Vavilala,Suma (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 258  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	7	4	3.35	1432/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	4	7	6	3.65	1310/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	0	3	6	3	3.57	1144/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	6	6	3.60	1271/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	1	4	9	4.00	813/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1222/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	9	5	3.65	1241/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	845/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1036/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1279/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1338/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	7	0	7	3.87	1161/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	1197/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	853/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	2	1	3	3.11	1146/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	1	0	0	6	3.78	1047/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	932/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	754/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	4	0	4	3	5	3.31	173/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	144/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	57/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	114/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	132/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.73
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 4  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith, Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 259  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	4	6	3	3.29	1441/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	7	1	3.18	1445/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	2	2	4	2	3.17	1236/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	3	4	3	3.13	1408/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	3	8	3.88	956/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	6	1	3.33	1264/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1368/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	1006/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1289/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	6	3	5	3.69	1338/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1162/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	3.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1161/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	1213/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	5	1	4	2	0	2.25	1213/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	1	4	3	3.45	1068/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	1	3	3.18	1189/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	5	1	2	3.10	1217/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	209/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	164/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	3.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	80/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	101/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	164/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	3.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	5	1	3	3.27	151/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.27
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 6	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 17
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 4  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Peters,Hannah (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 260  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	4	6	3	3.29	1441/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	7	1	3.18	1445/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	2	2	4	2	3.17	1236/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	3	4	3	3.13	1408/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	3	8	3.88	956/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	6	1	3.33	1264/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1368/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	1006/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	3	3	3	1	2.83	1419/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1326/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1398/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	3.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1222/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	2	1	4	3.18	1332/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	1	4	3	3.45	1068/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	1	3	3.18	1189/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	5	1	2	3.10	1217/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	209/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	164/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	3.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	80/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	101/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	164/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	3.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	5	1	3	3.27	151/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.27
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 6  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 261  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	7	3	3	3.12	1469/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	3	3	3.18	1445/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	6	2	2	3.15	1238/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	4	6	1	3.07	1415/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	8	2	3.47	1195/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	2	7	0	3.08	1315/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	5	2	0	2.24	1477/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	2.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	957/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1101/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1128/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	1200/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	3	7	4	3.69	1228/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	2	6	3.65	1227/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	853/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1216/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	3	3	0	0	2.29	1248/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	2.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1213/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	142/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	123/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	133/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.30
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	153/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	3.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	103/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 17
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 2			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 6  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Zhang,Hailiang (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 262  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	7	3	3	3.12	1469/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	3	3	3.18	1445/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	6	2	2	3.15	1238/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	4	6	1	3.07	1415/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	3.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	8	2	3.47	1195/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	2	7	0	3.08	1315/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	5	2	0	2.24	1477/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	2.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	957/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1332/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1268/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1217/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1005/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1265/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	809/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1216/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	3	3	0	0	2.29	1248/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	2.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1213/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	142/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	123/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	133/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.30
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	153/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	3.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	103/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 17
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 2			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 1			



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 7  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 263  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	6	6	3.90	1214/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	4	3.70	1290/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	2	7	5	3.82	1064/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	8	6	4.06	945/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	563/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	1043/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	917/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	845/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	786/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	878/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	665/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	936/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	7	7	4.05	1024/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1113/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	2.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1001/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	620/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	152/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	47/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	86/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	97/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	141/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	88/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 7  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Bediako, Bernice (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 264  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	6	6	3.90	1214/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	4	3.70	1290/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	2	7	5	3.82	1064/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	8	6	4.06	945/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	563/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	1043/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	917/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	845/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	6	7	2	3.56	1220/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1179/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1333/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1204/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	2	4	3	3.58	1245/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1233/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	2.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1001/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	620/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	152/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	47/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	86/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	97/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	141/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	88/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 8  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 265  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	673/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	636/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	755/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	686/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	623/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	767/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	9	4.00	986/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	722/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	381/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	430/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	442/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	671/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	0	3	3	3	3.45	1007/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	558/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1023/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	867/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	585/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	47/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	59/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	77/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	152/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	52/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 8  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith, Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 265  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 8  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Ravindran, Avinn (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 266  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	673/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	636/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	755/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	686/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	623/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	767/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	9	4.00	986/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	722/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	6	6	2	3.38	1303/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	5	3	6	3.69	1338/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	1285/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	4	4	3.50	1277/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1047/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1104/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	558/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1023/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	867/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	585/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	47/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	59/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	77/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	152/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	52/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 8  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Ravindran, Avinn (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 266  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 9  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 267  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	9	5	3	3.56	1384/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	942/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	1036/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	945/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	776/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	962/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	4	7	3.67	1236/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	853/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	839/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	588/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	849/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	848/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	888/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	505/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	366/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	106/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	105/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	157/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	119/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	141/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 9  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Smith, Paul J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 267  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						



Course-Section: CHEM 102L 9  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Bediako, Bernice (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 268  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	9	5	3	3.56	1384/1509	3.74	4.00	4.31	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	942/1509	3.84	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	1036/1287	3.72	3.93	4.30	4.24	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	945/1459	3.76	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	776/1406	4.01	3.95	4.09	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	962/1384	3.69	3.83	4.11	3.98	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	4	7	3.67	1236/1489	3.50	3.98	4.17	4.20	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.73	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1187/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1141/1438	4.17	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1228/1421	4.32	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	617/1411	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1010/1405	3.91	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	1104/1236	3.21	3.62	4.00	3.87	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	505/1260	3.79	3.62	4.14	3.95	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	3.88	3.96	4.33	4.15	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	3.95	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	366/ 873	4.07	3.82	4.03	3.89	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	106/ 184	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.06	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	105/ 198	4.25	4.19	4.22	4.14	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	157/ 184	4.42	4.52	4.48	4.48	4.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	119/ 177	4.01	4.24	4.36	4.29	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	141/ 165	3.86	4.07	4.18	4.15	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 9  
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I  
 Instructor: Bediako, Bernice (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 268  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 123 1  
 Title Gen Organic & Biochem  
 Instructor: Tracy, Allison M  
 Enrollment: 96  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 269  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	13	43	4.65	422/1509	4.65	4.00	4.31	4.18	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	18	37	4.50	543/1509	4.50	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	9	14	36	4.46	578/1287	4.46	3.93	4.30	4.24	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	1	4	9	26	4.50	454/1459	4.50	3.87	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	4	1	9	14	20	3.94	897/1406	3.94	3.95	4.09	4.02	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	0	0	5	11	17	4.36	492/1384	4.36	3.83	4.11	3.98	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	8	43	4.53	422/1489	4.53	3.98	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	0	47	11	4.12	1340/1506	4.12	4.78	4.67	4.66	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	4	0	1	0	17	27	4.56	286/1463	4.56	3.76	4.09	4.02	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	9	47	4.81	363/1438	4.81	4.26	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	55	4.96	215/1421	4.96	4.45	4.73	4.66	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	11	41	4.64	442/1411	4.64	4.02	4.31	4.27	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	6	49	4.81	285/1405	4.81	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	36	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	607/1236	4.11	3.62	4.00	3.87	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	****/1260	****	3.62	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	****/1255	****	3.96	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	50	6	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: CHEM 123 1  
 Title Gen Organic & Biochem  
 Instructor: Tracy, Allison M  
 Enrollment: 96  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 269  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	17	General	3	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 2  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Cullum, Brian M. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 270  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	8	6	3.68	1330/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	6	7	3.77	1246/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	10	7	4.00	924/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	868/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	8	3	3.28	1276/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1217/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	875/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	682/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	11	4	3	3.29	1329/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	800/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	1303/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	10	6	3.77	1197/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	8	6	3.68	1213/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	6	5	5	3.53	974/1236	3.77	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	145/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	91/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.28
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	60/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	75/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	4	3	9	3.94	111/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 2  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Mang, Stephen A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 271  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	8	6	3.68	1330/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	6	7	3.77	1246/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	10	7	4.00	924/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	868/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	8	3	3.28	1276/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1217/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	875/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	682/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	8	7	3	3.72	1125/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1135/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1162/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	416/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1306/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	3.77	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	145/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	91/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.28
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	60/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	75/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	4	3	9	3.94	111/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 2  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Klutse, Charles (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 272  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	8	6	3.68	1330/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	6	7	3.77	1246/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	10	7	4.00	924/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	868/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	8	3	3.28	1276/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1217/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	875/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	682/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1092/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	3.77	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	145/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	91/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.28
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	60/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	75/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	4	3	9	3.94	111/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 2  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Gray, Andrea (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 273  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	8	6	3.68	1330/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	6	7	3.77	1246/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	10	7	4.00	924/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	868/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	8	3	3.28	1276/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1217/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	875/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	682/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	1092/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	3.77	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	145/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	91/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.28
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	60/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	75/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	4	3	9	3.94	111/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			



Course-Section: CHEM 300 3  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Cullum, Brian M. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 274  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1359/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1322/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	924/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	979/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1178/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1127/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	853/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1162/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1277/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1047/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	904/1236	3.77	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	932/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	106/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	95/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.80
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 300 3  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Cullum, Brian M. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 274  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 3  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Mang, Stephen A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 275  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1359/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1322/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	924/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	979/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1178/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1127/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1207/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1051/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	634/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	932/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	106/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	95/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.80
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1359/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1322/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	924/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	979/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1178/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1127/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	853/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1257/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1047/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	932/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	106/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	95/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.80
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1359/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1322/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	924/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	979/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1178/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1127/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	690/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1257/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1047/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	932/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	106/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	95/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.80
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

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



Course-Section: CHEM 300 4  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Cullum, Brian M. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 278  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1051/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	621/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	886/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1367/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1009/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1107/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	833/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1084/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	1285/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	3.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	943/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	881/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	598/1236	3.77	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	0	5	3	3.70	153/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	172/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	27/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	161/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	134/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.70
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 4  
 Title Analytical Chemistry  
 Instructor: Mang, Stephen A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 279  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1051/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	621/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	886/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1367/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1009/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1107/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	833/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1194/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1315/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1401/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	3.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1361/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	0	5	3	3.70	153/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	172/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	27/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	161/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	134/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.70
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1051/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	621/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	886/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1367/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1009/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1107/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	833/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	1370/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	3.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	0	5	3	3.70	153/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	172/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	27/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	161/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	134/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.70
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	11	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1051/1509	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	621/1509	3.95	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	886/1287	4.03	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1367/1459	3.83	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1009/1406	3.53	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1107/1384	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	833/1489	4.07	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1463	3.72	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1438	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	4.28	4.45	4.73	4.73	3.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1405	3.97	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	3.50	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1255	3.00	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	0	5	3	3.70	153/ 184	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	172/ 198	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	27/ 184	4.87	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	161/ 177	4.19	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	134/ 165	4.15	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.70
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	11	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 301 1  
 Title Physical Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Arnold,Bradley  
 Enrollment: 119  
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 282  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	6	20	22	17	3.69	1330/1509	3.69	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	7	14	23	19	3.69	1298/1509	3.69	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	9	12	20	23	3.76	1088/1287	3.76	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	35	4	3	5	8	11	3.61	1265/1459	3.61	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	8	12	16	18	9	3.13	1315/1406	3.13	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	2	1	3	20	11	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	16	41	4.39	619/1489	4.39	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	1	1	0	0	63	4.89	602/1506	4.89	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	3	4	20	21	11	3.56	1224/1463	3.56	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	10	17	38	4.38	960/1438	4.38	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	4	11	50	4.65	1026/1421	4.65	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	13	12	23	14	3.49	1280/1411	3.49	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	4	12	14	32	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	46	7	4	1	3	3	2.50	1197/1236	2.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	61	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	****/1260	****	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	63	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1255	****	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	64	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	62	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	23						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	67	Non-major	53
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 2  
 Title Advanced Lab I  
 Instructor: Mang, Stephen A. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 283  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1114/1509	4.07	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	4	3	3.47	1381/1509	3.27	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1055/1459	4.03	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	8	0	3.31	1264/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	4	2	2	2.75	1438/1489	3.18	3.98	4.17	4.14	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	8	4	2	3.57	1217/1463	3.51	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	917/1438	4.41	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	1211/1421	4.41	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	1260/1411	3.56	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	7	3	3.47	1273/1405	3.40	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	3	3	2	5	3.50	984/1236	3.75	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1260	3.75	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1255	3.25	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	84/ 184	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	165/ 198	3.95	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	168/ 184	4.31	4.52	4.48	4.52	3.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	154/ 177	4.18	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	4	6	3	3	3.31	149/ 165	3.27	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 8
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 4			
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0			
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 2  
 Title Advanced Lab I  
 Instructor: Zukowski, Eli (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 284  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1114/1509	4.07	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	4	3	3.47	1381/1509	3.27	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1055/1459	4.03	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	8	0	3.31	1264/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	4	2	2	2.75	1438/1489	3.18	3.98	4.17	4.14	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	799/1463	3.51	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1438	4.41	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1421	4.41	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1411	3.56	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1405	3.40	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1236	3.75	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1260	3.75	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1255	3.25	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	84/ 184	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	165/ 198	3.95	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	168/ 184	4.31	4.52	4.48	4.52	3.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	154/ 177	4.18	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	4	6	3	3	3.31	149/ 165	3.27	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 2  
 Title Advanced Lab I  
 Instructor: Zhang, Yu (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 285  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1114/1509	4.07	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	4	3	3.47	1381/1509	3.27	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1055/1459	4.03	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	8	0	3.31	1264/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	4	2	2	2.75	1438/1489	3.18	3.98	4.17	4.14	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1168/1463	3.51	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1438	4.41	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1421	4.41	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1411	3.56	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1405	3.40	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1236	3.75	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1260	3.75	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1255	3.25	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	84/ 184	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	165/ 198	3.95	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	168/ 184	4.31	4.52	4.48	4.52	3.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	154/ 177	4.18	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	4	6	3	3	3.31	149/ 165	3.27	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			



Course-Section: CHEM 311L 2  
 Title Advanced Lab I  
 Instructor: Ghann, William (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 286  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1114/1509	4.07	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	4	3	3.47	1381/1509	3.27	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1055/1459	4.03	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	8	0	3.31	1264/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	4	2	2	2.75	1438/1489	3.18	3.98	4.17	4.14	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1332/1463	3.51	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1438	4.41	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1421	4.41	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1411	3.56	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1405	3.40	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1236	3.75	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1260	3.75	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1255	3.25	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	84/ 184	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	165/ 198	3.95	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	168/ 184	4.31	4.52	4.48	4.52	3.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	154/ 177	4.18	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	4	6	3	3	3.31	149/ 165	3.27	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 3  
 Title Advanced Lab I  
 Instructor: Mang, Stephen A. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 287  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NA		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1010/1509	4.07	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	2	3.07	1459/1509	3.27	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	885/1459	4.03	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	635/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1263/1489	3.18	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1101/1463	3.51	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	930/1438	4.41	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	1217/1421	4.41	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1270/1411	3.56	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1306/1405	3.40	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	664/1236	3.75	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	936/1260	3.75	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1180/1255	3.25	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1222/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	55/ 184	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.46
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	110/ 198	3.95	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	68/ 184	4.31	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	65/ 177	4.18	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	154/ 165	3.27	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.23
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 3  
 Title Advanced Lab I  
 Instructor: Zukowski, Eli (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 288  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1010/1509	4.07	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	2	3.07	1459/1509	3.27	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	885/1459	4.03	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	635/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1263/1489	3.18	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	628/1463	3.51	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	4.41	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.41	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	936/1260	3.75	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1180/1255	3.25	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1222/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	55/ 184	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.46
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	110/ 198	3.95	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	68/ 184	4.31	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	65/ 177	4.18	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	154/ 165	3.27	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.23
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 3  
 Title Advanced Lab I  
 Instructor: Zhang, Yu (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 289  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1010/1509	4.07	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	2	3.07	1459/1509	3.27	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	885/1459	4.03	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	635/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1263/1489	3.18	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	1442/1463	3.51	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1438	4.41	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	4.41	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	936/1260	3.75	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1180/1255	3.25	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1222/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	55/ 184	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.46
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	110/ 198	3.95	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	68/ 184	4.31	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	65/ 177	4.18	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	154/ 165	3.27	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.23
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 3  
 Title Advanced Lab I  
 Instructor: Ghann, William (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 290  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1010/1509	4.07	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	2	3.07	1459/1509	3.27	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	885/1459	4.03	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	635/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1263/1489	3.18	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1392/1463	3.51	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	936/1260	3.75	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1180/1255	3.25	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1222/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	55/ 184	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.46
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	110/ 198	3.95	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	68/ 184	4.31	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	65/ 177	4.18	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	154/ 165	3.27	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.23
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	13	34	148	4.66	410/1509	4.53	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	15	45	136	4.60	424/1509	4.31	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	28	53	112	4.40	648/1287	4.31	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	87	2	4	17	33	54	4.21	826/1459	4.16	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	9	8	20	36	106	4.24	599/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	118	1	2	15	21	39	4.22	659/1384	4.07	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	2	15	49	129	4.56	387/1489	4.37	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	192	4.98	175/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	39	3	0	0	13	54	89	4.49	353/1463	4.27	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	13	172	4.90	233/1438	4.55	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	13	176	4.93	376/1421	4.91	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	12	34	140	4.69	389/1411	4.22	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	15	27	143	4.66	459/1405	4.34	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	57	10	10	22	26	50	3.81	819/1236	3.94	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	163	0	7	2	5	9	12	3.49	****/1260	3.90	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	164	0	2	8	6	6	12	3.53	****/1255	4.17	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	164	0	4	3	6	7	14	3.71	****/1258	4.13	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	164	23	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	196	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	197	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	197	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	196	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	196	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	197	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	197	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	197	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	197	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 2	A 61	Required for Majors 163	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	49	1.00-1.99 1	B 55		
56-83	38	2.00-2.99 10	C 35	General 0	Under-grad 198 Non-major 181
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 26	D 4		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 74	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 5		

Course-Section: CHEM 351 2  
 Title Organic Chemistry I  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M  
 Enrollment: 146  
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 292  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	2	7	28	47	4.39	745/1509	4.53	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	4	18	27	34	4.02	1071/1509	4.31	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	5	8	35	37	4.22	803/1287	4.31	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	31	1	2	8	22	21	4.11	902/1459	4.16	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	2	0	7	23	45	4.42	434/1406	4.33	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	55	1	3	5	7	12	3.93	912/1384	4.07	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	4	15	18	44	4.18	833/1489	4.37	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	1	0	0	2	80	4.93	466/1506	4.95	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	1	2	14	22	24	4.05	831/1463	4.27	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	15	27	38	4.20	1110/1438	4.55	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	5	77	4.88	588/1421	4.91	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	8	20	24	27	3.75	1208/1411	4.22	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	7	15	19	39	4.01	1042/1405	4.34	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	3	6	10	20	36	4.07	635/1236	3.94	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	2	10	3	14	3.90	869/1260	3.90	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	58	0	1	2	5	5	17	4.17	839/1255	4.17	3.96	4.33	4.37	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	58	0	2	1	4	7	16	4.13	884/1258	4.13	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	58	14	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	78	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	78	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	79	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	80	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	80	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	86	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	86	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	86	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351 2  
Title Organic Chemistry I  
Instructor: Perks, Harry M  
Enrollment: 146  
Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2009

Page 292  
MAR 22, 2010  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	88	Non-major	82
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	12	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 10  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 293  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	9	1	3.82	1280/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	1444/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	755/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	979/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1009/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1159/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1263/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1207/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1326/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	933/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1315/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1301/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1012/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	746/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	142/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	123/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	97/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	2	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	168/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	3	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	122/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.86

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 10  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Ginevan, Brando (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 294  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	9	1	3.82	1280/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	1444/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	755/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	979/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1009/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1159/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1263/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1084/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1420/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	1345/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1361/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1348/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1188/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	746/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	142/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	123/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	97/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	2	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	168/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	3.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	3	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	122/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.86

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 11  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 295  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1044/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1013/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	924/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	902/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	400/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	403/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	674/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1021/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	1116/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1051/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	940/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	960/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	156/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	108/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	105/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	110/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	42/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 11  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Bhagchandani, Y (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 296  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1044/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1013/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	924/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	902/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	400/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	403/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	674/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1354/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1203/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1373/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1174/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1047/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	156/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	108/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	105/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	110/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	42/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 12  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 297  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	962/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	1053/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	619/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	223/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	492/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	986/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1217/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	865/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	867/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	881/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	904/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	96/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	117/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.09
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	127/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	83/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	61/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 12  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Temburnikar, Ka (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 298  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	962/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	1053/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	619/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	223/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	492/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	986/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1006/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	496/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	96/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	117/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.09
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	127/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	83/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	61/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 13  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 299  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1184/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1298/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	0	4	5	3.40	1188/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1135/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	768/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	3	6	3.69	1095/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	1	8	3.69	1227/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	4	6	0	3.25	1338/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1116/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1270/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	5	3	3.27	1319/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	1	2	4	5	3.47	1002/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	106/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	112/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	112/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	110/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	133/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 13  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Orwenyo, Jared (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 300  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1184/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1298/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	0	4	5	3.40	1188/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1135/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	768/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	3	6	3.69	1095/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	1	8	3.69	1227/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	8	3	1	3.42	1289/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	712/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1369/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1235/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1299/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	106/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	112/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	112/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	110/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	133/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 14  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 301  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1399/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	2	3.86	1196/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1010/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	1296/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	7	1	3.54	1166/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	3	5	1	3.27	1282/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	4	2	3.29	1370/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	896/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1262/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	5	4	3.77	1311/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1072/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	7	2	3.54	1270/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	1	3.31	1312/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	984/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1203/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1097/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1025/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	442/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	145/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	162/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	116/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	27/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	120/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	1	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 14  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Tran, Thao (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 302  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1399/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	2	3.86	1196/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1010/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	1296/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	7	1	3.54	1166/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	3	5	1	3.27	1282/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	4	2	3.29	1370/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	896/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	608/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1135/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1257/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1051/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	960/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	536/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1203/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1097/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1025/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	442/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	145/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	162/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	116/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	27/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	120/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 15  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 303  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1058/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	952/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	886/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1111/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	934/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1132/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	854/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1314/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	865/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	779/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	881/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	466/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1226/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1167/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1184/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	106/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	50/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	62/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	80/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	73/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 10
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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 15  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Anderson, Brian (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 304  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1058/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	952/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	886/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1111/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	934/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1132/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	854/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	853/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	513/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	664/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1226/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1167/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1184/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	106/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	50/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	62/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	80/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	73/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 10
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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 16  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 305  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	516/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	459/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	578/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	280/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	551/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	531/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	728/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1052/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	800/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	665/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	858/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	393/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	373/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	526/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	58/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	54/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	114/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	52/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	35/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 16  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Trzcinski, Greg (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 306  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	516/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	459/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	578/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	280/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	551/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	531/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	728/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	690/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	904/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1060/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	858/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	664/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	526/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	58/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	54/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	114/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	52/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	35/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 17  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 307  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	833/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1252/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	1	2	2	2.82	1277/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	2.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1342/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	986/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1145/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1082/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	6	0	3.36	1306/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1365/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1257/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1277/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1301/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	2	4	1	3.22	1084/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	106/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	86/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	150/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	125/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	88/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 17  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Dahal, Sudhir (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 308  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	833/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1252/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	1	2	2	2.82	1277/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	2.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1342/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	986/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1145/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1082/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	228/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1203/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	1345/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1051/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1248/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	106/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	86/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	150/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	125/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	88/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 19  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 309  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	598/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	543/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1084/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1260/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	332/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	531/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	823/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	598/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	675/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	979/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	738/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	859/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	466/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	47/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	59/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	53/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	101/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	96/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 19  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Orwenyo, Jared (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 310  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	598/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	543/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1084/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1260/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	332/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	531/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	823/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	800/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1060/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	985/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1047/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	47/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	59/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	53/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	101/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	96/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 2  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 311  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1051/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1020/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1031/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	657/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	934/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	939/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1106/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	853/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	970/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1049/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1051/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1172/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	841/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1102/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1084/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1184/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	84/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	114/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	155/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	101/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	81/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 2  
Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
Enrollment: 16  
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2009

Page 311  
MAR 22, 2010  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 2  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Tran, Thao (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 312  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1051/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1020/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1031/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	657/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	934/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	939/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1106/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1168/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	5	0	3.57	1361/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1372/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1051/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1248/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1131/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1102/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1084/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1184/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	84/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	114/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	155/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	101/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	81/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 2  
Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
Instructor: Tran, Thao (Instr. B)  
Enrollment: 16  
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2009

Page 312  
MAR 22, 2010  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 3  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 313  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	987/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1202/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	924/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1103/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1105/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	440/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1319/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1052/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	1182/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	863/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1201/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	2	3	3.54	1257/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	2	5	2	3.45	1007/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	3	1	2	4	3.70	153/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	179/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	105/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	4	1	2	3	0	2.40	175/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	2.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	128/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 3  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Ginevan, Brando (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 314  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	987/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1202/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	924/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1103/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1105/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	440/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1319/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	2	5	0	3.20	1354/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	2	0	2	1	2.50	1428/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1402/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	3	3	0	1	1	2.25	1401/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1384/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	3	1	2	4	3.70	153/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	179/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	105/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	4	1	2	3	0	2.40	175/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	2.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	128/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.80

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 4  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 315  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1265/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	1	3.58	1339/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1195/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1260/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1168/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1271/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	1156/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1168/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1203/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1049/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1215/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1230/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	0	5	2	3.67	904/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	70/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	165/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	126/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	73/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	52/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 4  
Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
Enrollment: 18  
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2009

Page 315  
MAR 22, 2010  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 4  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Trzcinski, Greg (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 316  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1265/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	1	3.58	1339/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1195/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1260/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1168/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1271/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	1156/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	325/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1116/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1257/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1051/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1047/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1219/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	70/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	165/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	126/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	73/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	52/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 4  
Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
Instructor: Trzcinski, Greg (Instr. B)  
Enrollment: 18  
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2009

Page 316  
MAR 22, 2010  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 5  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 317  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	800/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	636/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	614/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	586/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	300/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	479/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	906/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1273/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1297/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1222/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1047/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	563/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	161/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	47/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	150/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	81/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0						
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0						
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0	Other	0				

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 5  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Dahal, Sudhir (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 318  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	800/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	636/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	614/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	586/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	300/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	479/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	906/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	500/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	794/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	459/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	904/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	161/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	47/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	150/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	81/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0						
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0						
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0	Other	0				

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 6  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 319  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	1399/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1208/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1020/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1283/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1107/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1271/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	983/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	1055/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1145/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	947/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1104/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	84/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	45/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	90/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	46/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	35/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 11
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0			
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 6  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Wauchope, Orret (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 320  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	1399/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1208/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1020/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1283/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1107/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1271/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	151/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	588/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1014/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	416/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1047/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	84/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	45/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	90/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	46/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	35/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			



Course-Section: CHEM 351L 7  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 321  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1184/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	7	1	3.60	1331/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	1	8	2	3.50	1168/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	4	0	4	3	3	3.07	1414/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	4	3	4	3.36	1252/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1302/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	4	5	3.53	1291/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	6	1	3.67	1168/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	1	3	8	4.07	1182/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	4	5	4	3.60	1256/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1257/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	824/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1081/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	904/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1222/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	801/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	135/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	91/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	138/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	138/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.09
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	117/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 7  
Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
Enrollment: 18  
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2009

Page 321  
MAR 22, 2010  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other 1		
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 7  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Bhagchandani, Y (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 322  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1184/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	7	1	3.60	1331/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	1	8	2	3.50	1168/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	4	0	4	3	3	3.07	1414/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	4	3	4	3.36	1252/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1302/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	4	5	3.53	1291/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1273/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	646/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1234/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1051/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	788/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1088/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1081/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	904/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1222/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	801/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	135/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	91/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	138/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	138/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.09
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	117/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 7  
Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
Instructor: Bhagchandani, Y (Instr. B)  
Enrollment: 18  
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2009

Page 322  
MAR 22, 2010  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 8  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 323  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	505/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1027/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	739/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	924/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	683/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	349/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	986/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	722/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	998/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1071/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	716/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1174/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1123/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	853/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	936/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1054/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1070/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	44/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	86/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	68/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	61/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 8  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Guei, Jules (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 324  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	505/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1027/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	739/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	924/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	683/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	349/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	986/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	722/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	800/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	885/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1047/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	936/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1054/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1070/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	44/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	86/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	68/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	61/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 9  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 325  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1340/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	2	3	2	3.17	1447/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1225/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1296/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	3	3	3.25	1283/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	0	3	2	3.25	1286/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1374/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1364/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1294/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1189/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1293/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1301/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	1131/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1113/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	1251/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	2.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1251/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	853/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	167/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	165/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	141/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	120/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	73/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 9  
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab  
 Instructor: Anderson, Brian (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 326  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1340/1509	4.08	4.00	4.31	4.32	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	2	3	2	3.17	1447/1509	3.92	3.97	4.26	4.25	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1225/1287	3.84	3.93	4.30	4.33	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1296/1459	3.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	3	3	3.25	1283/1406	4.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	0	3	2	3.25	1286/1384	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.15	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1374/1489	3.82	3.98	4.17	4.14	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.91	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1207/1463	3.81	3.76	4.09	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1353/1438	4.15	4.26	4.46	4.43	3.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1234/1421	4.55	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1277/1411	3.91	4.02	4.31	4.29	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1348/1405	3.87	4.00	4.32	4.32	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1230/1236	3.50	3.62	4.00	4.07	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1113/1260	3.63	3.62	4.14	4.22	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	1251/1255	3.70	3.96	4.33	4.37	2.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1251/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.42	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	853/ 873	3.54	3.82	4.03	4.08	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	167/ 184	4.03	4.08	4.16	4.07	3.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	165/ 198	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	141/ 184	4.44	4.52	4.48	4.52	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	120/ 177	4.31	4.24	4.36	4.30	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	73/ 165	4.24	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CHEM 405 1  
 Title Inorganic Chemistry  
 Instructor: Szalai,Veronika  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 327  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	8	9	3.79	1291/1509	3.79	4.00	4.31	4.39	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	7	9	3.75	1259/1509	3.75	3.97	4.26	4.26	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	8	7	3.58	1140/1287	3.58	3.93	4.30	4.38	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	2	4	9	5	3.59	1275/1459	3.59	3.87	4.22	4.32	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	3	6	8	3.76	1038/1406	3.76	3.95	4.09	4.11	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	0	2	7	8	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	7	11	4.04	958/1489	4.04	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506	4.96	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	3	5	6	2	3.05	1386/1463	3.05	3.76	4.09	4.18	3.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	5	15	4.39	940/1438	4.39	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	483/1421	4.91	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	2	3	8	6	3.43	1299/1411	3.43	4.02	4.31	4.35	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	5	9	3.61	1241/1405	3.61	4.00	4.32	4.34	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	1174/1236	2.80	3.62	4.00	4.03	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1108/1260	3.30	3.62	4.14	4.25	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	4	0	0	3	3	3.10	1201/1255	3.10	3.96	4.33	4.46	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1159/1258	3.44	3.84	4.38	4.51	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	2	4	0	4	3.60	671/ 873	3.60	3.82	4.03	4.26	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	Graduate	Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	Under-grad	Non-major 7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 2			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other		
			? 3			

Course-Section: CHEM 420 1  
 Title Computer Appl In Chem  
 Instructor: Johnson, Bruce A  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 328  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.00	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	543/1509	4.50	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	3.93	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	378/1459	4.57	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	720/1406	4.13	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	896/1489	4.13	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	1133/1463	3.71	3.76	4.09	4.18	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1071/1438	4.25	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	885/1411	4.25	4.02	4.31	4.35	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	126/1236	4.75	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1260	****	3.62	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1255	****	3.96	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437 1  
 Title Comprehensive Biochem  
 Instructor: Fabris, Daniele (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 171  
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 329  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	3	6	21	33	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	8	15	19	18	3.65	1310/1509	3.65	3.97	4.26	4.26	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	7	19	20	14	3.56	1151/1287	3.56	3.93	4.30	4.38	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	46	1	4	3	4	4	3.38	****/1459	****	3.87	4.22	4.32	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	3	9	5	10	29	3.95	885/1406	3.95	3.95	4.09	4.11	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	53	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/1384	****	3.83	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	2	6	20	30	4.29	728/1489	4.29	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	3	0	0	0	0	57	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	2	4	15	23	11	3.67	1161/1463	3.55	3.76	4.09	4.18	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	13	44	4.64	631/1438	4.39	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	2	2	9	48	4.69	991/1421	4.50	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	5	4	10	20	22	3.82	1182/1411	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.35	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	3	4	9	14	30	4.07	1019/1405	3.96	4.00	4.32	4.34	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	14	3	4	7	11	18	3.86	794/1236	3.87	3.62	4.00	4.03	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	55	0	6	0	1	3	2	2.58	****/1260	****	3.62	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	3	1	1	3	4	3.33	****/1255	****	3.96	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	56	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	54	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	65	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	65	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: CHEM 437 1  
 Title Comprehensive Biochem  
 Instructor: Fabris, Daniele (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 171  
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 329  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	52	Graduate	4	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	63	Non-major	66
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 437 1  
 Title Comprehensive Biochem  
 Instructor: Olson, Wendy J. (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 171  
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 330  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	3	6	21	33	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	8	15	19	18	3.65	1310/1509	3.65	3.97	4.26	4.26	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	7	19	20	14	3.56	1151/1287	3.56	3.93	4.30	4.38	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	46	1	4	3	4	4	3.38	****/1459	****	3.87	4.22	4.32	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	3	9	5	10	29	3.95	885/1406	3.95	3.95	4.09	4.11	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	53	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/1384	****	3.83	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	2	6	20	30	4.29	728/1489	4.29	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	3	0	0	0	0	57	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	3	5	21	17	9	3.44	1278/1463	3.55	3.76	4.09	4.18	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	3	11	16	29	4.15	1141/1438	4.39	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	1	9	13	36	4.31	1269/1421	4.50	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	10	11	20	18	3.69	1228/1411	3.75	4.02	4.31	4.35	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	8	2	9	14	28	3.85	1154/1405	3.96	4.00	4.32	4.34	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	10	2	5	9	11	19	3.87	794/1236	3.87	3.62	4.00	4.03	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	55	0	6	0	1	3	2	2.58	****/1260	****	3.62	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	3	1	1	3	4	3.33	****/1255	****	3.96	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	56	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	54	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	4.08	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.19	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	4.52	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	4.24	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	65	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	65	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: CHEM 437 1  
 Title Comprehensive Biochem  
 Instructor: Olson, Wendy J. (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 171  
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 330  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	52	Graduate	4	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	63	Non-major	66
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	291/1509	4.77	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	167/1509	4.87	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	250/1287	4.69	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1459	4.78	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	813/1406	4.23	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	140/1384	4.77	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	330/1489	4.72	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	151/1463	4.61	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1438	4.85	4.26	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	4.73	4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1411	4.86	4.02	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	239/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	96/1236	4.77	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1260	4.29	3.62	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1255	5.00	3.96	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	4.86	3.84	4.38	4.51	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.08	4.16	4.62	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	27/ 198	4.86	4.19	4.22	4.37	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 184	4.96	4.52	4.48	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.24	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 165	4.92	4.07	4.18	4.29	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	291/1509	4.77	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	167/1509	4.87	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	250/1287	4.69	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1459	4.78	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	813/1406	4.23	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	140/1384	4.77	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	330/1489	4.72	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	235/1463	4.61	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1438	4.85	4.26	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	4.73	4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1411	4.86	4.02	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	4.77	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1260	4.29	3.62	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1255	5.00	3.96	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	4.86	3.84	4.38	4.51	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.08	4.16	4.62	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	27/ 198	4.86	4.19	4.22	4.37	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 184	4.96	4.52	4.48	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.24	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 165	4.92	4.07	4.18	4.29	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.80	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.25	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	3.67	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.67	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.25	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 437L 3  
 Title Biochemistry Laborator  
 Instructor: Tracy,Allison M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 333  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1509	4.77	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	133/1509	4.87	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	414/1287	4.69	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	218/1459	4.78	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	4.23	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	132/1384	4.77	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	133/1489	4.72	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	95/1463	4.61	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	131/1438	4.85	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	4.73	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	83/1411	4.86	4.02	4.31	4.35	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	251/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	147/1236	4.77	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	597/1260	4.29	3.62	4.14	4.25	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	3.96	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.86	3.84	4.38	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.08	4.16	4.62	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	16/ 198	4.86	4.19	4.22	4.37	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	21/ 184	4.96	4.52	4.48	4.66	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.24	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	20/ 165	4.92	4.07	4.18	4.29	4.85

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 3  
 Title Biochemistry Laborator  
 Instructor: Tomney, Matthew (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 334  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1509	4.77	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	133/1509	4.87	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	414/1287	4.69	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	218/1459	4.78	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	4.23	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	132/1384	4.77	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	133/1489	4.72	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	668/1463	4.61	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	675/1438	4.85	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1312/1421	4.73	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	469/1411	4.86	4.02	4.31	4.35	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	788/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1236	4.77	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	597/1260	4.29	3.62	4.14	4.25	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	3.96	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.86	3.84	4.38	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.08	4.16	4.62	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	16/ 198	4.86	4.19	4.22	4.37	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	21/ 184	4.96	4.52	4.48	4.66	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.24	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	20/ 165	4.92	4.07	4.18	4.29	4.85

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 444 1  
 Title Molecular Modeling  
 Instructor: Thorpe, Ian F  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 335  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1228/1509	3.80	3.97	4.26	4.26	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	638/1287	4.40	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	619/1459	4.40	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1009/1406	3.80	3.95	4.09	4.11	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	677/1384	4.20	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1489	4.80	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	3.76	4.09	4.18	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	930/1438	4.40	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1309/1411	3.40	4.02	4.31	4.35	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	940/1405	4.20	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1219/1236	2.00	3.62	4.00	4.03	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.62	4.14	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	783/1255	4.25	3.96	4.33	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	3.84	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.82	4.03	4.26	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.62	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	4.19	4.22	4.37	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	105/ 184	4.50	4.52	4.48	4.66	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	141/ 177	4.00	4.24	4.36	4.47	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.07	4.18	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 451 1  
 Title Mech Of Organic Reacti  
 Instructor: Fishbein,James  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 336  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	9	9	4.14	1010/1509	4.14	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	9	7	3.86	1189/1509	3.86	3.97	4.26	4.26	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	9	9	4.14	863/1287	4.14	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	2	4	5	7	3.79	1177/1459	3.79	3.87	4.22	4.32	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	7	5	6	3.67	1105/1406	3.67	3.95	4.09	4.11	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	8	4	7	3.80	1017/1384	3.80	3.83	4.11	4.23	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	3	8	6	3.59	1267/1489	3.59	3.98	4.17	4.18	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	965/1506	4.64	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	13	3	3.77	1084/1463	3.77	3.76	4.09	4.18	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	5	14	4.41	930/1438	4.41	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	991/1421	4.68	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	5	8	3.77	1197/1411	3.77	4.02	4.31	4.35	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	881/1405	4.27	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1171/1236	2.83	3.62	4.00	4.03	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1145/1260	3.13	3.62	4.14	4.25	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	783/1255	4.25	3.96	4.33	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	932/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 7 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 490 1  
 Title Special Topics In Chem  
 Instructor: Daniel,Marie-Ch  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 337  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1509	4.91	4.00	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1183/1509	4.26	3.97	4.26	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	924/1287	4.42	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1336/1459	4.16	3.87	4.22	4.32	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1333/1406	4.11	3.95	4.09	4.11	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	962/1384	4.30	3.83	4.11	4.23	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	986/1489	4.29	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.18	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	853/1463	4.38	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	800/1438	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.94	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	985/1411	4.12	4.02	4.31	4.35	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	513/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	466/1236	4.25	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 2	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 490 2  
 Title Special Topics In Chem  
 Instructor: Kelly,Lisa A  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 338  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1509	4.91	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	952/1509	4.26	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	519/1287	4.42	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1238/1459	4.16	3.87	4.22	4.32	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	135/1406	4.11	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	440/1384	4.30	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1155/1489	4.29	3.98	4.17	4.18	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1459/1506	4.18	4.78	4.67	4.67	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.38	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.60

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	800/1438	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.94	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1051/1411	4.12	4.02	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	634/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	536/1236	4.25	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.20

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	982/1260	4.37	3.62	4.14	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	4.81	3.96	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.77	3.84	4.38	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490 3  
 Title Special Topics In Chem  
 Instructor: LaCourse,Willia  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 339  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.91	4.00	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	952/1509	4.26	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	708/1287	4.42	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	454/1459	4.16	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	502/1406	4.11	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1384	4.30	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	458/1489	4.29	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1459/1506	4.18	4.78	4.67	4.67	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	467/1463	4.38	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1438	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1277/1411	4.12	4.02	4.31	4.35	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	828/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	563/1236	4.25	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	666/1260	4.37	3.62	4.14	4.25	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	4.81	3.96	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.77	3.84	4.38	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490 4  
 Title Special Topics In Chem  
 Instructor: Radtke,Katherin  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 340  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies									Instructor Mean Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	374/1509	4.91	4.00	4.31	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	412/1509	4.26	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	250/1287	4.42	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	843/1459	4.16	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	909/1406	4.11	3.95	4.09	4.11	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	320/1384	4.30	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	330/1489	4.29	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1273/1506	4.18	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	452/1463	4.38	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	950/1438	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	665/1411	4.12	4.02	4.31	4.35	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	211/1236	4.25	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	352/1260	4.37	3.62	4.14	4.25	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1255	4.81	3.96	4.33	4.46	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	4.77	3.84	4.38	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.82	4.03	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CHEM 490 6  
 Title Special Topics In Chem  
 Instructor: Ptaszek, Marcin  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 341  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.91	4.00	4.31	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	543/1509	4.26	3.97	4.26	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1287	4.42	3.93	4.30	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.16	3.87	4.22	4.32	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	332/1406	4.11	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.30	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	458/1489	4.29	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.18	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.38	3.76	4.09	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	617/1411	4.12	4.02	4.31	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.68	4.00	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.25	3.62	4.00	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.37	3.62	4.14	4.25	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.81	3.96	4.33	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.77	3.84	4.38	4.51	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 690 1  
 Title Chemistry Seminar  
 Instructor: Garcin,Elsa D.  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 342  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1340/1509	3.67	4.00	4.31	4.39	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	356/1509	4.67	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	3.93	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.87	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	3.95	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384	4.67	3.83	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.98	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	3.76	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.45	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.02	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.00	4.32	4.33	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	415/1260	4.50	3.62	4.14	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	3.96	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	3.84	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	3.82	4.03	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 713 1  
 Title Biochem Seminar  
 Instructor: Garcin,Elsa D.  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 343  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1321/1509	3.35	4.00	4.31	4.39	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	891/1509	4.61	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1118/1287	3.67	3.93	4.30	4.22	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1367/1459	3.33	3.87	4.22	4.16	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1283/1406	3.63	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1168/1384	3.78	3.83	4.11	4.16	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.98	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1451/1506	3.94	4.78	4.67	4.71	3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1060/1463	3.90	3.76	4.09	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1315/1438	3.75	4.26	4.46	4.49	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1345/1421	4.00	4.45	4.73	4.78	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1187/1411	3.80	4.02	4.31	4.33	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1348/1405	3.00	4.00	4.32	4.33	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.62	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.62	4.14	4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	526/1255	4.57	3.96	4.33	4.43	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	700/1258	4.43	3.84	4.38	4.50	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	3.82	4.03	4.01	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 89	4.80	4.80	4.49	4.39	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	90/ 92	3.25	3.25	4.54	4.52	3.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	84/ 90	3.67	3.67	4.50	4.48	3.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	81/ 92	3.67	3.67	4.38	4.30	3.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	47/ 93	4.25	4.25	4.06	4.04	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 713 2  
 Title Biochem Seminar  
 Instructor: Garcin,Elsa D.  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 344  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1473/1509	3.35	4.00	4.31	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.61	3.97	4.26	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	3.63	3.95	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	3.78	3.83	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.98	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	3.94	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	3.90	3.76	4.09	4.15	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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