

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	10	16	12	3.79	1364/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	16	16	4.00	1151/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	2	10	6	19	3.90	1149/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	2	3	11	5	8	3.48	1430/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	5	10	11	8	3.31	1392/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	3	4	8	3	3	2.95	1420/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	2.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	13	12	11	3.58	1374/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	26	17	4.40	1222/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	3	0	7	20	6	3.72	1233/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	12	26	4.44	964/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	1	8	29	4.37	1367/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	5	15	16	3.90	1255/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	5	1	7	8	19	3.88	1269/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	7	0	8	6	18	3.72	1028/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	3	5	12	14	3.63	1082/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	6	5	23	4.15	909/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	3	7	9	15	3.67	1190/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	5	0	7	8	14	3.76	705/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.76

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 60				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 44				
Instructor: Carpenter,Tara														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 60
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 44
<b>Instructor:</b> Carpenter,Tara		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	10	16	12	3.79	1364/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	16	16	4.00	1151/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	2	10	6	19	3.90	1149/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	2	3	11	5	8	3.48	1430/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	5	10	11	8	3.31	1392/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	3	4	8	3	3	2.95	1420/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	2.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	13	12	11	3.58	1374/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	26	17	4.40	1222/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	0	1	9	20	3	3.76	1209/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	1	7	22	4.58	773/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	1167/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	1	7	5	15	4.10	1112/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	5	0	2	5	15	3.93	1235/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	5	0	6	6	11	3.64	1067/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	3	5	12	14	3.63	1082/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	6	5	23	4.15	909/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	3	7	9	15	3.67	1190/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	5	0	7	8	14	3.76	705/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.76

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Szychowski,Bria</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	10	16	12	3.79	1364/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	16	16	4.00	1151/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	2	10	6	19	3.90	1149/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	2	3	11	5	8	3.48	1430/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	5	10	11	8	3.31	1392/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	3	4	8	3	3	2.95	1420/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	2.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	13	12	11	3.58	1374/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	26	17	4.40	1222/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	4	0	3	8	11	4	3.62	1312/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1406/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	1	2	5	3	10	3.90	1500/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	3	5	3	5	3.63	1380/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	3	0	4	1	5	3.38	1433/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	4	2	1	6	2	2	3.08	1302/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	3	5	12	14	3.63	1082/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	6	5	23	4.15	909/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	3	7	9	15	3.67	1190/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	5	0	7	8	14	3.76	705/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.76

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 02		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 60					
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I									Questionnaires: 44					
Instructor: Szychowski,Bria														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 60
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 44
<b>Instructor:</b> Szychowski,Bria		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	10	16	12	3.79	1364/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	16	16	4.00	1151/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	2	10	6	19	3.90	1149/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	2	3	11	5	8	3.48	1430/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	5	10	11	8	3.31	1392/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	3	4	8	3	3	2.95	1420/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	2.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	13	12	11	3.58	1374/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	26	17	4.40	1222/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	4	4	3	8	9	6	3.33	1438/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	1223/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	6	1	7	14	4.04	1473/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	2	5	7	5	7	3.38	1436/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	4	1	2	4	11	3.77	1325/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	4	3	0	5	4	8	3.70	1036/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	3	5	12	14	3.63	1082/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	6	5	23	4.15	909/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	3	7	9	15	3.67	1190/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	5	0	7	8	14	3.76	705/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.76

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 60				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 44				
Instructor: Bass,Sarah														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	18	22	16	3.80	1358/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	9	11	18	20	3.75	1363/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	22	21	3.92	1140/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	2	3	11	14	8	3.61	1381/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	4	11	16	21	3.82	1095/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	39	2	3	6	8	2	3.24	1369/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	13	10	27	3.83	1240/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	39	18	4.27	1331/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	6	3	9	19	9	3.48	1381/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	9	12	36	4.37	1050/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	4	12	40	4.49	1269/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	4	12	15	21	3.71	1355/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	5	6	8	32	3.86	1275/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	5	3	10	11	23	3.85	943/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	11	5	11	17	13	3.28	1221/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	3	12	12	27	4.00	989/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	4	14	14	17	3.54	1224/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	6	1	12	8	18	3.69	745/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 72					
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I									Questionnaires: 60					
Instructor: Carpenter, Tara														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	2	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 03	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 72
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 60
<b>Instructor:</b> Carpenter,Tara		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	5	A	17	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	18	22	16	3.80	1358/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	9	11	18	20	3.75	1363/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	22	21	3.92	1140/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	2	3	11	14	8	3.61	1381/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	4	11	16	21	3.82	1095/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	39	2	3	6	8	2	3.24	1369/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	13	10	27	3.83	1240/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	39	18	4.27	1331/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	2	3	16	15	4	3.40	1416/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	2	0	5	8	24	4.33	1095/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	2	2	4	11	26	4.27	1421/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	2	6	11	9	13	3.61	1387/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	2	4	3	10	6	14	3.62	1381/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	12	4	1	7	5	10	3.59	1094/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	11	5	11	17	13	3.28	1221/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	3	12	12	27	4.00	989/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	4	14	14	17	3.54	1224/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	6	1	12	8	18	3.69	745/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.69



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 72					
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I									Questionnaires: 60					
Instructor: Hamilton,Diana														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	2	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	5	A	17	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Resch,Lauren</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	18	22	16	3.80	1358/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	9	11	18	20	3.75	1363/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	22	21	3.92	1140/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	2	3	11	14	8	3.61	1381/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	4	11	16	21	3.82	1095/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	39	2	3	6	8	2	3.24	1369/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	13	10	27	3.83	1240/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	39	18	4.27	1331/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	6	5	16	11	2	2.95	1518/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	4	1	6	6	17	3.91	1378/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	5	1	7	17	12	3.71	1513/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	5	2	8	13	8	3.47	1416/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	2	5	4	6	9	10	3.44	1419/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	20	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	****/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	11	5	11	17	13	3.28	1221/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	3	12	12	27	4.00	989/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	4	14	14	17	3.54	1224/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	6	1	12	8	18	3.69	745/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 72					
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I									Questionnaires: 60					
Instructor: Resch,Lauren														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	2	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Resch,Lauren</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	5	A	17	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yoon,Joyce</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	18	22	16	3.80	1358/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	9	11	18	20	3.75	1363/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	22	21	3.92	1140/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	2	3	11	14	8	3.61	1381/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	4	11	16	21	3.82	1095/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	39	2	3	6	8	2	3.24	1369/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	13	10	27	3.83	1240/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	39	18	4.27	1331/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	1	1	8	19	12	3.98	994/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	2	5	7	19	4.11	1273/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	4	13	24	4.43	1332/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	2	8	13	13	4.03	1159/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	2	2	2	7	10	13	3.88	1263/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	20	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1078/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	11	5	11	17	13	3.28	1221/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	3	12	12	27	4.00	989/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	4	14	14	17	3.54	1224/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	6	1	12	8	18	3.69	745/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 60				
Instructor: Yoon,Joyce														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	2	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yoon,Joyce</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	5	A	17	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>56</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	14	10	26	3.96	1226/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	7	22	21	4.02	1145/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	12	20	20	3.98	1078/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	6	11	9	11	3.61	1381/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	10	16	23	4.09	849/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	0	3	8	9	5	3.64	1205/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	13	32	4.27	829/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	31	23	4.34	1276/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	4	13	17	10	3.69	1263/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.87
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	5	11	33	4.25	1169/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	7	10	37	4.51	1261/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	2	5	18	23	3.93	1238/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	2	15	28	4.13	1105/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	5	2	7	12	24	3.96	842/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.04
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	9	18	19	3.85	964/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	6	5	6	32	4.06	973/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	4	7	12	24	3.88	1080/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	3	3	11	7	25	3.98	580/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.98

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>56</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	5	A	17	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	17	General	2	Under-grad	56	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 04	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	72
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	56
<b>Instructor:</b>	Hamilton,Diana			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	14	10	26	3.96	1226/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	7	22	21	4.02	1145/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	12	20	20	3.98	1078/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	6	11	9	11	3.61	1381/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	10	16	23	4.09	849/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	0	3	8	9	5	3.64	1205/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	13	32	4.27	829/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	31	23	4.34	1276/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	3	1	1	11	23	1	3.59	1323/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.87
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	1	0	2	6	24	4.58	787/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	3	7	27	4.65	1127/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	0	9	8	17	4.14	1081/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	2	6	7	17	4.12	1113/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	2	3	3	1	11	13	3.90	912/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.04
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	9	18	19	3.85	964/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	6	5	6	32	4.06	973/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	4	7	12	24	3.88	1080/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	3	3	11	7	25	3.98	580/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.98

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>56</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	23	0.00-0.99 5	A 17	Required for Majors 48	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 17	General 2	Under-grad 56 Non-major 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Macazo,Flaire</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>56</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	14	10	26	3.96	1226/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	7	22	21	4.02	1145/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	12	20	20	3.98	1078/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	6	11	9	11	3.61	1381/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	10	16	23	4.09	849/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	0	3	8	9	5	3.64	1205/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	13	32	4.27	829/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	31	23	4.34	1276/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	5	1	0	4	20	9	4.06	918/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.87
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	2	0	2	3	22	4.48	912/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	1	1	7	26	4.66	1114/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	1	4	8	18	4.39	843/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	1	2	1	5	5	19	4.19	1065/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	6	2	2	1	7	13	4.08	753/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.04
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	9	18	19	3.85	964/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	6	5	6	32	4.06	973/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	4	7	12	24	3.88	1080/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	3	3	11	7	25	3.98	580/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.98

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Macazo,Flaire</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>56</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	23	0.00-0.99 5	A 17	Required for Majors 48	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 17	General 2	Under-grad 56 Non-major 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yoon,Joyce</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>56</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	14	10	26	3.96	1226/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	7	22	21	4.02	1145/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	12	20	20	3.98	1078/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	6	11	9	11	3.61	1381/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	10	16	23	4.09	849/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	0	3	8	9	5	3.64	1205/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	13	32	4.27	829/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	31	23	4.34	1276/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	6	0	0	4	21	8	4.12	854/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.87
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	2	0	1	3	23	4.55	816/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	1114/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	3	8	20	4.55	645/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	2	1	3	5	20	4.29	965/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	6	2	1	1	7	14	4.20	629/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.04
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	9	18	19	3.85	964/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	6	5	6	32	4.06	973/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	4	7	12	24	3.88	1080/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	3	3	11	7	25	3.98	580/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.98

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yoon,Joyce</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>56</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	23	0.00-0.99 5	A 17	Required for Majors 48	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 17	General 2	Under-grad 56 Non-major 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	5	11	22	24	3.82	1345/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	19	24	16	3.67	1414/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	10	10	24	20	3.72	1227/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	1	4	9	22	7	3.70	1338/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	6	12	21	23	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	41	0	3	9	6	6	3.63	1216/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	12	25	25	4.08	1032/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	2	0	2	35	25	4.27	1340/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	2	5	15	29	6	3.56	1338/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	5	4	24	33	4.29	1145/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	3	9	15	37	4.24	1429/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	6	5	14	22	18	3.63	1377/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	5	12	16	28	3.95	1212/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	6	6	10	20	19	3.66	1062/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	8	13	23	14	3.52	1134/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	12	14	12	25	3.79	1125/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	8	16	16	16	3.49	1233/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.49
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	10	6	11	12	19	3.41	869/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.41

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	2	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	4	Under-grad	68	Non-major	66
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	5	11	22	24	3.82	1345/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	19	24	16	3.67	1414/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	10	10	24	20	3.72	1227/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	1	4	9	22	7	3.70	1338/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	6	12	21	23	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	41	0	3	9	6	6	3.63	1216/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	12	25	25	4.08	1032/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	2	0	2	35	25	4.27	1340/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	5	0	3	23	16	5	3.49	1376/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	1	5	16	19	4.29	1137/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	1	6	11	21	4.33	1389/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	3	12	14	11	3.76	1333/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	4	8	11	12	3.73	1347/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	4	2	7	8	8	9	3.44	1173/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	8	13	23	14	3.52	1134/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	12	14	12	25	3.79	1125/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	8	16	16	16	3.49	1233/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.49
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	10	6	11	12	19	3.41	869/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.41

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 05		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 68				
Instructor: Hamilton,Diana														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	2	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	4	Under-grad	68	Non-major	66
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Szychowski,Bria</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	5	11	22	24	3.82	1345/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	19	24	16	3.67	1414/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	10	10	24	20	3.72	1227/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	1	4	9	22	7	3.70	1338/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	6	12	21	23	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	41	0	3	9	6	6	3.63	1216/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	12	25	25	4.08	1032/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	2	0	2	35	25	4.27	1340/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	2	4	19	16	6	3.43	1406/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	2	3	6	15	8	3.71	1441/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	34	0	0	3	5	10	16	4.15	1457/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	2	4	5	10	12	3.79	1319/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	36	0	4	3	5	11	9	3.56	1395/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	37	7	2	5	8	8	1	3.04	1306/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	8	13	23	14	3.52	1134/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	12	14	12	25	3.79	1125/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	8	16	16	16	3.49	1233/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.49
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	10	6	11	12	19	3.41	869/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.41

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 05		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 68				
Instructor: Szychowski,Bria														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	2	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Szychowski,Bria</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	4	Under-grad	68	Non-major	66
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	5	11	22	24	3.82	1345/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	19	24	16	3.67	1414/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	10	10	24	20	3.72	1227/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	1	4	9	22	7	3.70	1338/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	6	12	21	23	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	41	0	3	9	6	6	3.63	1216/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	12	25	25	4.08	1032/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	2	0	2	35	25	4.27	1340/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	4	0	1	8	25	12	4.04	925/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	1	2	6	13	11	3.94	1365/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	34	0	0	0	5	10	19	4.41	1341/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	0	4	3	12	14	4.09	1117/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	3	3	3	13	11	3.79	1321/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	8	3	4	6	9	2	3.13	1292/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	8	13	23	14	3.52	1134/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	12	14	12	25	3.79	1125/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	8	16	16	16	3.49	1233/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.49
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	10	6	11	12	19	3.41	869/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.41

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 05		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 68				
Instructor: Carbonaro,Nicol														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	2	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>68</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	4	Under-grad	68	Non-major	66
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	10	13	20	4.04	1153/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	18	17	4.04	1127/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	18	21	4.17	946/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	0	9	10	9	3.90	1194/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	3	11	26	4.40	531/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	2	3	5	9	3.81	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	14	24	4.30	774/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	24	19	4.41	1213/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	9	21	9	3.83	1143/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	4	36	4.57	801/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	0	4	8	32	4.40	1350/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	7	13	20	4.00	1171/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	7	29	4.28	974/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	2	4	13	23	4.20	629/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.85
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	9	8	21	3.89	938/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	12	9	19	4.00	989/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	8	10	21	4.07	989/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	2	1	7	10	16	4.03	544/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.03

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 06	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 60
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 47
<b>Instructor:</b> Carpenter,Tara		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	10	13	20	4.04	1153/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	18	17	4.04	1127/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	18	21	4.17	946/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	0	9	10	9	3.90	1194/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	3	11	26	4.40	531/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	2	3	5	9	3.81	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	14	24	4.30	774/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	24	19	4.41	1213/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	2	3	14	17	1	3.32	1441/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	7	8	16	4.19	1223/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	2	5	6	20	4.24	1432/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	2	3	6	7	12	3.80	1311/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	2	7	6	13	3.77	1325/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	4	2	4	6	5	11	3.68	1051/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.85
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	9	8	21	3.89	938/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	12	9	19	4.00	989/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	8	10	21	4.07	989/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	2	1	7	10	16	4.03	544/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.03



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 06	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	60
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	47
<b>Instructor:</b>	Hamilton,Diana			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 06	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	60
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	47
<b>Instructor:</b>	Carbonaro,Nicol			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	10	13	20	4.04	1153/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	18	17	4.04	1127/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	18	21	4.17	946/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	0	9	10	9	3.90	1194/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	3	11	26	4.40	531/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	2	3	5	9	3.81	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	14	24	4.30	774/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	24	19	4.41	1213/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	2	6	18	5	3.84	1143/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	1	8	18	4.54	844/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	2	7	22	4.56	1213/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	2	3	6	17	4.36	883/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	2	4	4	18	4.24	1012/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	4	2	2	5	6	9	3.75	1000/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.85
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	9	8	21	3.89	938/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	12	9	19	4.00	989/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	8	10	21	4.07	989/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	2	1	7	10	16	4.03	544/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.03

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 06	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	60
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	47
<b>Instructor:</b>	Audino, Jacquely			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	10	13	20	4.04	1153/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	18	17	4.04	1127/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	18	21	4.17	946/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	0	9	10	9	3.90	1194/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	3	11	26	4.40	531/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	2	3	5	9	3.81	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	14	24	4.30	774/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	24	19	4.41	1213/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	2	5	22	3	3.81	1161/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	1	10	16	4.46	938/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	1154/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	1	3	10	14	4.32	922/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	2	4	6	16	4.17	1073/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	4	2	3	4	5	10	3.75	1000/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.85
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	9	8	21	3.89	938/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	12	9	19	4.00	989/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	8	10	21	4.07	989/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	2	1	7	10	16	4.03	544/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.03

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 06	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 60
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 47
<b>Instructor:</b> Audino, Jacquely		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 08	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	60
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	46
<b>Instructor:</b>	Carpenter,Tara			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	14	20	4.13	1078/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	13	25	4.35	840/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	7	31	4.48	639/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	1	7	6	13	4.04	1059/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	5	5	9	24	4.21	744/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	25	0	2	7	7	5	3.71	1163/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	12	28	4.55	452/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	18	25	4.48	1145/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	4	15	18	4.29	658/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	6	33	4.71	559/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	6	34	4.72	1012/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	1	11	28	4.47	743/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	4	3	30	4.28	984/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	4	2	9	24	4.36	489/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.93
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	3	8	11	10	3.56	1117/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	7	10	16	4.06	973/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	10	7	15	3.86	1091/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	4	2	8	6	12	3.63	779/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>46</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	46
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>46</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	14	20	4.13	1078/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	13	25	4.35	840/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	7	31	4.48	639/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	1	7	6	13	4.04	1059/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	5	5	9	24	4.21	744/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	25	0	2	7	7	5	3.71	1163/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	12	28	4.55	452/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	18	25	4.48	1145/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	3	2	11	12	4	3.38	1425/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	887/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	1314/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	1	2	6	10	7	3.77	1328/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	2	4	6	9	3.67	1368/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	2	3	2	4	6	6	3.48	1157/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.93
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	3	8	11	10	3.56	1117/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	7	10	16	4.06	973/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	10	7	15	3.86	1091/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	4	2	8	6	12	3.63	779/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>46</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	46
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>46</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	14	20	4.13	1078/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	13	25	4.35	840/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	7	31	4.48	639/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	1	7	6	13	4.04	1059/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	5	5	9	24	4.21	744/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	25	0	2	7	7	5	3.71	1163/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	12	28	4.55	452/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	18	25	4.48	1145/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	2	6	13	7	3.89	1089/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	858/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	1189/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	983/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	945/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	3	1	2	0	4	5	3.83	949/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.93
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	3	8	11	10	3.56	1117/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	7	10	16	4.06	973/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	10	7	15	3.86	1091/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	4	2	8	6	12	3.63	779/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>46</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	46
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>46</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	11	14	20	4.13	1078/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	13	25	4.35	840/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	7	31	4.48	639/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	16	1	1	7	6	13	4.04	1059/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	5	5	9	24	4.21	744/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	25	0	2	7	7	5	3.71	1163/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	12	28	4.55	452/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	18	25	4.48	1145/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	2	5	15	10	4.03	933/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	5	3	17	4.38	1038/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	3	5	19	4.50	1261/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	1	6	6	13	4.07	1129/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	2	2	8	11	4.08	1138/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	2	0	3	2	7	9	4.05	774/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.93
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	3	8	11	10	3.56	1117/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	7	10	16	4.06	973/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	10	7	15	3.86	1091/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	4	2	8	6	12	3.63	779/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>46</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	46
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	16	18	16	3.81	1351/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	24	18	4.06	1121/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	9	22	20	4.13	979/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	2	3	8	15	11	3.77	1294/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	5	11	16	17	3.80	1115/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	5	4	10	10	3	3.06	1405/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	7	12	11	22	3.87	1218/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	3	29	19	4.27	1340/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	4	1	11	18	6	3.53	1357/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	3	5	14	26	4.12	1273/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	1	4	8	35	4.46	1296/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	5	1	7	18	18	3.88	1271/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	3	7	10	25	3.94	1220/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	7	1	8	9	21	3.78	979/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	14	11	20	3.74	1033/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	4	11	14	19	3.77	1137/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	13	16	17	3.79	1134/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	5	3	10	14	15	3.66	762/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.66

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	1	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	21	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	16	18	16	3.81	1351/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	24	18	4.06	1121/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	9	22	20	4.13	979/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	2	3	8	15	11	3.77	1294/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	5	11	16	17	3.80	1115/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	5	4	10	10	3	3.06	1405/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	7	12	11	22	3.87	1218/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	3	29	19	4.27	1340/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	5	16	16	2	3.38	1422/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	3	4	6	10	19	3.90	1385/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	1	6	10	24	4.31	1407/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	2	8	14	14	3.97	1196/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	3	9	10	15	3.92	1235/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	2	4	9	11	12	3.71	1028/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	14	11	20	3.74	1033/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	4	11	14	19	3.77	1137/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	13	16	17	3.79	1134/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	5	3	10	14	15	3.66	762/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.66

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 09		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 54				
Instructor: Hamilton,Diana														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	1	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	21	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Macazo,Flaire</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	16	18	16	3.81	1351/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	24	18	4.06	1121/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	9	22	20	4.13	979/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	2	3	8	15	11	3.77	1294/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	5	11	16	17	3.80	1115/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	5	4	10	10	3	3.06	1405/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	7	12	11	22	3.87	1218/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	3	29	19	4.27	1340/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	0	0	17	12	6	3.69	1263/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	3	0	7	11	13	3.91	1378/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	0	7	11	20	4.26	1425/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	11	12	12	3.94	1221/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	4	6	11	13	3.89	1263/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	0	3	12	8	6	3.59	1099/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	14	11	20	3.74	1033/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	4	11	14	19	3.77	1137/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	13	16	17	3.79	1134/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	5	3	10	14	15	3.66	762/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.66

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Macazo,Flaire</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	1	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Macazo,Flaire</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	21	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	16	18	16	3.81	1351/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	24	18	4.06	1121/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	9	22	20	4.13	979/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	2	3	8	15	11	3.77	1294/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	5	11	16	17	3.80	1115/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	5	4	10	10	3	3.06	1405/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	7	12	11	22	3.87	1218/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	3	29	19	4.27	1340/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	3	0	0	10	19	6	3.89	1098/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	2	0	8	11	13	3.97	1338/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	7	10	20	4.35	1378/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	5	14	16	4.31	935/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	4	4	13	14	4.06	1151/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	1	2	10	8	8	3.69	1046/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	14	11	20	3.74	1033/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	4	11	14	19	3.77	1137/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	13	16	17	3.79	1134/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	5	3	10	14	15	3.66	762/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.66

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 09		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 54				
Instructor: Carbonaro,Nicol														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	1	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	21	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	11	15	26	3.92	1282/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	6	16	31	4.15	1044/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	13	36	4.30	828/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	2	1	8	14	20	4.09	1023/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	5	7	10	28	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	4	3	3	6	16	3.84	1051/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	0	9	15	31	4.22	885/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	26	29	4.46	1154/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	2	12	21	16	3.89	1098/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	2	7	47	4.63	711/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	0	0	8	48	4.66	1100/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	3	16	34	4.27	974/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	8	13	33	4.19	1065/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	6	13	32	4.23	603/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.05
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	9	16	24	3.93	904/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	3	8	13	29	4.11	958/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	14	8	29	4.07	986/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	5	1	8	13	27	4.04	539/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.04

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	5	A	28	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	59	Non-major	60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 10	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	72
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	60
<b>Instructor:</b>	Hamilton,Diana			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	11	15	26	3.92	1282/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	6	16	31	4.15	1044/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	13	36	4.30	828/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	2	1	8	14	20	4.09	1023/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	5	7	10	28	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	4	3	3	6	16	3.84	1051/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	0	9	15	31	4.22	885/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	26	29	4.46	1154/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	4	0	27	17	2	3.26	1459/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	1	1	5	8	26	4.39	1027/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	1	0	2	8	29	4.60	1181/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	3	0	8	13	15	3.95	1221/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	5	3	5	11	15	3.72	1351/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	6	2	1	8	7	15	3.97	842/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.05
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	9	16	24	3.93	904/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	3	8	13	29	4.11	958/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	14	8	29	4.07	986/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	5	1	8	13	27	4.04	539/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.04



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 60				
Instructor: Hamilton,Diana														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 5	A 28	Required for Majors 48	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 10	General 1	Under-grad 59 Non-major 60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 6		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yoon,Joyce</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	11	15	26	3.92	1282/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	6	16	31	4.15	1044/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	13	36	4.30	828/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	2	1	8	14	20	4.09	1023/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	5	7	10	28	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	4	3	3	6	16	3.84	1051/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	0	9	15	31	4.22	885/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	26	29	4.46	1154/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	3	0	4	6	21	12	3.95	1019/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	787/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	1	1	1	3	22	4.57	1205/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	1	1	2	7	17	4.36	883/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	4	0	3	3	18	4.11	1129/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	6	3	0	2	5	12	4.05	774/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.05
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	9	16	24	3.93	904/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	3	8	13	29	4.11	958/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	14	8	29	4.07	986/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	5	1	8	13	27	4.04	539/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.04

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 10		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 60				
Instructor: Yoon,Joyce														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yoon,Joyce</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	5	A	28	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	59	Non-major	60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 10	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	72
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	60
<b>Instructor:</b>	Carbonaro,Nicol			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	11	15	26	3.92	1282/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	6	16	31	4.15	1044/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	13	36	4.30	828/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	2	1	8	14	20	4.09	1023/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	5	7	10	28	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	4	3	3	6	16	3.84	1051/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	0	9	15	31	4.22	885/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	26	29	4.46	1154/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	18	0	0	9	9	5	3.83	1152/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	951/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	1	0	3	5	16	4.40	1350/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	0	2	3	6	14	4.28	966/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	3	2	3	3	14	3.92	1235/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	7	2	2	1	3	10	3.94	865/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.05
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	9	16	24	3.93	904/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	3	8	13	29	4.11	958/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	14	8	29	4.07	986/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	5	1	8	13	27	4.04	539/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.04

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>60</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	5	A	28	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	59	Non-major	60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>65</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	18	18	27	4.06	1138/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	13	21	27	4.08	1109/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	11	23	24	3.98	1078/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	2	5	11	19	13	3.72	1320/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	3	10	20	24	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	33	6	4	5	9	6	3.17	1386/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	11	23	25	4.05	1059/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	0	6	30	26	4.22	1385/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	2	12	28	11	3.80	1170/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	6	18	40	4.53	844/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	1	14	46	4.62	1167/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	7	29	21	4.03	1153/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	5	3	24	29	4.21	1050/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	4	12	15	27	4.07	764/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.61
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	4	16	17	21	3.71	1045/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	5	12	15	26	3.92	1072/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	6	13	10	28	3.85	1096/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	4	7	13	13	20	3.67	756/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 65				
Instructor: Carpenter,Tara														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	3	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	4	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>65</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	2	A	28	Required for Majors	59	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	65	Non-major	65
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>65</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	18	18	27	4.06	1138/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	13	21	27	4.08	1109/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	11	23	24	3.98	1078/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	2	5	11	19	13	3.72	1320/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	3	10	20	24	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	33	6	4	5	9	6	3.17	1386/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	11	23	25	4.05	1059/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	0	6	30	26	4.22	1385/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	5	2	20	19	3	3.27	1459/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	1	0	7	12	26	4.35	1084/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	1	2	10	31	4.61	1167/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	4	4	11	11	13	3.58	1391/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	3	1	5	5	14	16	3.95	1212/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	1	4	11	11	12	3.74	1007/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.61
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	4	16	17	21	3.71	1045/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	5	12	15	26	3.92	1072/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	6	13	10	28	3.85	1096/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	4	7	13	13	20	3.67	756/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 65				
Instructor: Hamilton,Diana														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	3	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	4	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>65</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99 2	A 28	Required for Majors 59	Graduate 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 10	General 2	Under-grad 65
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 2		Non-major 65
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Szychowski,Bria</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>65</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	18	18	27	4.06	1138/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	13	21	27	4.08	1109/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	11	23	24	3.98	1078/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	2	5	11	19	13	3.72	1320/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	3	10	20	24	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	33	6	4	5	9	6	3.17	1386/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	11	23	25	4.05	1059/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	0	6	30	26	4.22	1385/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	1	5	18	16	6	3.46	1391/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	1	1	9	7	17	4.09	1288/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	4	2	7	8	18	3.87	1503/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	7	3	10	7	10	3.27	1457/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	4	3	1	8	15	7	3.65	1375/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	11	3	4	8	4	6	3.24	1254/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.61
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	4	16	17	21	3.71	1045/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	5	12	15	26	3.92	1072/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	6	13	10	28	3.85	1096/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	4	7	13	13	20	3.67	756/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 65				
Instructor: Szychowski,Bria														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	3	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	4	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Szychowski,Bria</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>65</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99 2	A 28	Required for Majors 59	Graduate 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 10	General 2	Under-grad 65
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 2		Non-major 65
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Resch,Lauren</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>65</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	18	18	27	4.06	1138/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	13	21	27	4.08	1109/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	11	23	24	3.98	1078/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	2	5	11	19	13	3.72	1320/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	3	10	20	24	3.98	923/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	33	6	4	5	9	6	3.17	1386/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	11	23	25	4.05	1059/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	0	6	30	26	4.22	1385/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	5	4	12	17	7	3.38	1425/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	1	1	7	5	21	4.26	1169/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	4	2	5	8	21	4.00	1476/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	6	1	8	10	12	3.57	1395/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	4	2	3	5	13	11	3.82	1300/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	11	2	5	7	3	8	3.40	1195/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.61
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	4	16	17	21	3.71	1045/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	5	12	15	26	3.92	1072/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	6	13	10	28	3.85	1096/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	4	7	13	13	20	3.67	756/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 11		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 65				
Instructor: Resch,Lauren														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	3	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	4	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	1	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Resch,Lauren</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>65</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99 2	A 28	Required for Majors 59	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 10	General 2	Under-grad 65 Non-major 65
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	12	15	16	4.05	1153/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	12	22	4.20	996/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	16	19	4.16	963/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	1186/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	9	13	19	4.05	877/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	2	4	10	6	3.78	1104/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	9	8	24	4.16	959/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	4	15	23	4.34	1267/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	1	7	22	6	3.92	1068/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	0	10	30	4.56	816/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	7	32	4.65	1114/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	15	22	4.44	780/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	11	27	4.52	714/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	4	12	21	4.31	543/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.90
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	6	18	16	4.02	813/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.02
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	6	15	21	4.25	824/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	12	13	18	4.09	980/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	2	7	11	19	4.05	535/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.05

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 12	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	60
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	45
<b>Instructor:</b>	Carpenter,Tara			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99 4	A 18	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 9	General 3	Under-grad 45 Non-major 44
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	12	15	16	4.05	1153/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	12	22	4.20	996/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	16	19	4.16	963/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	1186/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	9	13	19	4.05	877/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	2	4	10	6	3.78	1104/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	9	8	24	4.16	959/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	4	15	23	4.34	1267/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	3	13	14	2	3.39	1419/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	2	5	5	21	4.26	1161/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	2	6	9	18	4.14	1460/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	1	8	7	16	4.09	1117/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	3	4	12	11	3.84	1288/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	0	4	5	4	12	3.96	842/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.90
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	6	18	16	4.02	813/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.02
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	6	15	21	4.25	824/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	12	13	18	4.09	980/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	2	7	11	19	4.05	535/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.05



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99 4	A 18	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 9	General 3	Under-grad 45 Non-major 44
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	12	15	16	4.05	1153/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	12	22	4.20	996/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	16	19	4.16	963/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	1186/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	9	13	19	4.05	877/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	2	4	10	6	3.78	1104/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	9	8	24	4.16	959/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	4	15	23	4.34	1267/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	0	0	7	18	6	3.97	1006/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	2	2	8	18	4.29	1137/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	6	9	17	4.27	1418/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	2	5	8	13	4.14	1081/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	2	6	6	11	3.92	1235/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	0	4	5	4	7	3.70	1036/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.90
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	6	18	16	4.02	813/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.02
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	6	15	21	4.25	824/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	12	13	18	4.09	980/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	2	7	11	19	4.05	535/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.05

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 12	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	60
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	45
<b>Instructor:</b>	Audino, Jacquely			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino, Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99 4	A 18	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 9	General 3	Under-grad 45 Non-major 44
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Resch,Lauren</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	12	15	16	4.05	1153/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	12	22	4.20	996/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	16	19	4.16	963/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	1186/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	9	13	19	4.05	877/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	1	2	4	10	6	3.78	1104/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	9	8	24	4.16	959/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	4	15	23	4.34	1267/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	3	6	15	6	3.71	1249/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	3	2	7	18	4.23	1193/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	6	11	14	4.19	1448/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	2	6	7	13	4.11	1112/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	2	6	8	9	3.85	1288/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	0	4	5	5	6	3.65	1062/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.90
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	6	18	16	4.02	813/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.02
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	6	15	21	4.25	824/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	12	13	18	4.09	980/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	2	7	11	19	4.05	535/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.05

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 12	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	60
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	45
<b>Instructor:</b>	Resch,Lauren			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Resch,Lauren</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>45</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	20	0.00-0.99 4	A 18	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 9	General 3	Under-grad 45 Non-major 44
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 5		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	8	9	16	24	3.98	1204/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	12	18	22	3.96	1197/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	11	19	23	4.09	1016/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	1	10	17	15	4.00	1081/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	8	19	23	4.13	814/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	2	9	9	10	3.81	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	11	16	25	4.09	1023/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	1	1	25	26	4.31	1304/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	3	1	11	24	12	3.80	1170/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	14	35	4.51	887/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	13	38	4.62	1167/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	8	19	24	4.11	1112/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	11	9	33	4.33	935/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	3	4	9	12	23	3.94	865/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	5	6	15	23	3.91	925/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	9	17	21	3.94	1044/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	8	3	13	14	15	3.47	1239/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	6	3	6	14	15	3.66	762/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.66

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	16	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	13						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101 14	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	72
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	58
<b>Instructor:</b>	Hamilton,Diana			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	8	9	16	24	3.98	1204/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	12	18	22	3.96	1197/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	11	19	23	4.09	1016/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	1	10	17	15	4.00	1081/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	8	19	23	4.13	814/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	2	9	9	10	3.81	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	11	16	25	4.09	1023/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	1	1	25	26	4.31	1304/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	3	5	17	14	4	3.26	1462/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	4	4	7	22	4.18	1223/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	4	6	7	25	4.19	1448/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	3	4	6	10	16	3.82	1299/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	2	2	4	8	20	4.17	1081/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	7	4	0	9	9	10	3.66	1062/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	5	6	15	23	3.91	925/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	9	17	21	3.94	1044/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	8	3	13	14	15	3.47	1239/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	6	3	6	14	15	3.66	762/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.66

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 14	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 72
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 58
<b>Instructor:</b> Hamilton,Diana		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	16	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	13						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	8	9	16	24	3.98	1204/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	12	18	22	3.96	1197/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	11	19	23	4.09	1016/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	1	10	17	15	4.00	1081/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	8	19	23	4.13	814/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	2	9	9	10	3.81	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	11	16	25	4.09	1023/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	1	1	25	26	4.31	1304/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	3	1	3	9	16	11	3.83	1152/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	2	4	12	26	4.41	1016/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	1	13	29	4.59	1189/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	3	5	12	22	4.11	1104/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	3	5	10	26	4.34	914/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	3	1	4	13	17	4.05	769/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	5	6	15	23	3.91	925/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	9	17	21	3.94	1044/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	8	3	13	14	15	3.47	1239/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	6	3	6	14	15	3.66	762/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.66

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 58				
Instructor: Bass,Sarah														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 14	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 72
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 58
<b>Instructor:</b> Bass,Sarah		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	16	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	13						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Macazo,Flaire</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	8	9	16	24	3.98	1204/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	12	18	22	3.96	1197/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	11	19	23	4.09	1016/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	1	10	17	15	4.00	1081/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	8	19	23	4.13	814/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	2	9	9	10	3.81	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	11	16	25	4.09	1023/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	1	1	25	26	4.31	1304/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	7	1	1	12	8	10	3.78	1185/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	1	3	4	20	4.41	1003/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	2	6	3	19	4.30	1407/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	3	5	5	17	4.20	1035/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	3	5	3	18	4.24	1012/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	9	2	2	3	6	9	3.82	959/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	5	6	15	23	3.91	925/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	9	17	21	3.94	1044/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	8	3	13	14	15	3.47	1239/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	6	3	6	14	15	3.66	762/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.66

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 14		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 72				
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 58				
Instructor: Macazo,Flaire														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 14	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 72
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 58
<b>Instructor:</b> Macazo,Flaire		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	16	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	13						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1512/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1320/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1265/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1371/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1411/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	5	1	3.09	1498/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	882/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1483/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1061/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1012/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1255/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1251/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	743/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1191/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	938/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1298/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 15	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 12
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 11
<b>Instructor:</b> Carpenter,Tara		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	934/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.14

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1512/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1320/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1265/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1371/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1411/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	5	1	3.09	1498/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	882/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1508/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1016/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	872/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	817/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1334/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1191/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	938/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1298/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	934/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.14

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 1	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,Nicol</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1512/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1320/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1265/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1371/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1411/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	5	1	3.09	1498/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	882/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1367/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	488/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	959/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1171/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1174/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1191/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	938/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1298/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 101 15	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 12
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 11
<b>Instructor:</b> Carbonaro,Nicol		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	934/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.14

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 1	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1512/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1320/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1265/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1371/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1411/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	5	1	3.09	1498/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	882/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1209/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	887/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	959/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1171/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	739/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1191/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	938/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1298/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	934/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.14

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 1	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1452/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1151/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1061/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1016/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	531/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1366/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1395/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	5	3	1	3.18	1479/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1153/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1350/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	0	2	3.20	1471/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1003/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	927/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.03
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	4	2	3.44	1166/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	1176/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1312/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	4	0	0	3	2	2.89	971/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	2.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1452/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1151/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1061/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1016/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	531/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1366/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1395/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	2	4	3	0	2.73	1544/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1459/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1525/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	2	0	2	2.86	1498/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1388/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1353/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.03
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	4	2	3.44	1166/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	1176/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1312/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	4	0	0	3	2	2.89	971/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	2.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Resch,Lauren</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1452/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1151/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1061/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1016/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	531/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1366/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1395/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	957/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1468/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1512/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1482/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1368/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1311/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.03
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	4	2	3.44	1166/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	1176/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1312/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	4	0	0	3	2	2.89	971/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	2.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Resch,Lauren</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1452/1589	3.88	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1151/1589	4.01	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1061/1391	4.04	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1016/1552	3.80	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	531/1495	3.96	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1087/1457	3.50	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1366/1572	3.98	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1395/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	369/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1016/1530	4.30	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1389/1533	4.38	4.47	4.75	4.69	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	909/1528	3.95	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	852/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1367/1393	3.79	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.03
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	4	2	3.44	1166/1337	3.68	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	1176/1331	3.99	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1312/1333	3.68	3.73	4.40	4.22	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	4	0	0	3	2	2.89	971/1014	3.66	3.69	4.05	3.91	2.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	435/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	943/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	921/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	1254/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	467/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	886/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.09
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	541/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	695/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	739/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	307/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.56
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	452/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	436/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	503/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	686/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	25/62	4.92	3.79	4.46	4.33	4.83
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	46/65	3.90	3.45	4.43	4.13	4.20
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	24/63	4.40	3.53	4.29	4.12	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	26/61	4.60	4.60	4.47	4.61	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	54/61	3.90	3.90	4.19	3.98	3.20
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
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	1				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	223/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	301/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1081/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	373/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	593/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	409/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1473/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	369/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	201/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	786/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	695/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	924/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	349/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1021/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	824/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	1166/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	854/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.44

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	4.92	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	3.90	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	4.40	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	4.60	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/61	3.90	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
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 1	
			? 0		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	223/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	301/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1081/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	373/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	593/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	409/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1473/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1305/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1193/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1154/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1171/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1282/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1104/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1021/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	824/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	1166/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	854/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.44

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	4.92	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	3.90	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	4.40	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	4.60	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/61	3.90	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
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 1	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	223/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	301/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1081/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	373/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	593/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	409/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1473/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1367/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1193/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1425/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1350/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1393/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1286/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1021/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	824/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	1166/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	854/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.44

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	4.92	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	3.90	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	4.40	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	4.60	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/61	3.90	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
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 1	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Szychowski,Bria</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	223/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	301/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1081/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	373/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	593/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	409/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1473/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1453/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1395/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1503/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1350/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1388/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1348/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1021/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	824/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	1166/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	854/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.44

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Szychowski,Bria</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	4.92	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	3.90	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	4.40	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	4.60	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/61	3.90	3.90	4.19	3.98	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
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 1	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	156/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	689/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	509/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	949/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	467/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	596/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	224/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	586/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	524/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	984/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	192/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	226/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	429/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.20

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/62	4.92	3.79	4.46	4.33	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	55/65	3.90	3.45	4.43	4.13	3.60
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	43/63	4.40	3.53	4.29	4.12	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	26/61	4.60	4.60	4.47	4.61	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	17/61	3.90	3.90	4.19	3.98	4.60

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	780/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	899/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	210/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1063/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	634/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	174/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	474/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	307/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	624/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	861/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1124/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 101H 08	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	12
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chem I - Honors		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	10
<b>Instructor:</b>	Carpenter,Tara			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	475/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.14

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
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						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	780/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	899/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	210/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1063/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1416/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	452/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	643/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	479/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	924/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	697/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	624/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	861/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1124/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	475/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.14

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	4 A 10	Required for Majors	10 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 0		
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
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			0 ? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	780/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	899/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	210/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1063/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1249/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	644/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1100/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	479/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	924/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	720/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	624/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	861/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1124/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	475/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.14

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	4 A 10	Required for Majors	10 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 0		
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
			0 P 0		**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			0 I 0	Other	0
			0 ? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 08</b>	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>								<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>			
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>									<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>			
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>													
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	780/1589	4.65	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	4.90	3.99	4.34	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1552	4.37	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	899/1495	4.27	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1457	4.47	3.70	4.15	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	210/1572	4.54	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1063/1589	4.44	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1396/1569	3.82	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1095/1530	4.57	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1221/1533	4.66	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1017/1528	4.35	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1121/1529	4.16	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	796/1393	4.01	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	624/1337	4.15	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	861/1331	4.35	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1124/1333	3.98	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101H 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chem I - Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	475/1014	3.83	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.14

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	4 A 10	Required for Majors	10 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 0		
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
			0 P 0		**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			0 I 0	Other	0
			0 ? 0		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	6	9	10	5	3.47	1510/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	7	7	3.37	1505/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	7	7	7	5	3.14	1352/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	3	7	7	3	3.08	1509/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	6	7	8	3.65	1221/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1163/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	8	7	11	3.77	1282/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	187/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	5	5	10	3	3.28	1453/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.30
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	1	3	7	13	3.96	1345/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	4	5	15	4.23	1432/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	4	7	8	4	3.23	1465/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	4	8	1	8	3.12	1481/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	5	2	7	3	3	2.85	1341/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.07
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	1	9	6	5	3.19	1247/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	1026/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	8	4	6	3.30	1277/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	3	6	2	6	3.25	911/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 8	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	6	9	10	5	3.47	1510/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	7	7	3.37	1505/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	7	7	7	5	3.14	1352/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	3	7	7	3	3.08	1509/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	6	7	8	3.65	1221/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1163/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	8	7	11	3.77	1282/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	187/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	4	11	8	0	3.08	1496/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.30
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	1281/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	1372/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	2	9	3	4	3.50	1409/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	3	3	4	2.89	1499/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	4	1	3	3	2	2.85	1342/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.07
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	1	9	6	5	3.19	1247/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	1026/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	8	4	6	3.30	1277/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	3	6	2	6	3.25	911/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 8	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schmitt,Daniell</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	6	9	10	5	3.47	1510/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	7	7	3.37	1505/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	7	7	7	5	3.14	1352/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	3	7	7	3	3.08	1509/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	6	7	8	3.65	1221/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1163/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	8	7	11	3.77	1282/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	187/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	4	1	8	7	3	3.17	1481/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.30
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1409/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1507/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	1	5	1	4	3.50	1409/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1426/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	5	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	****/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.07
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	1	9	6	5	3.19	1247/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	1026/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	8	4	6	3.30	1277/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	3	6	2	6	3.25	911/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schmitt,Daniell</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 8	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Macazo,Flaire</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	6	9	10	5	3.47	1510/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	7	7	3.37	1505/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	7	7	7	5	3.14	1352/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	3	7	7	3	3.08	1509/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	6	7	8	3.65	1221/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1163/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	8	7	11	3.77	1282/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	187/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	8	8	5	3.65	1284/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.30
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1292/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	1469/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	1	5	1	5	3.62	1383/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	1400/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	5	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1142/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.07
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	1	9	6	5	3.19	1247/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	1026/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	8	4	6	3.30	1277/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	3	6	2	6	3.25	911/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Macazo,Flaire</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 8	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	4	10	16	11	3.58	1476/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	4	16	13	8	3.43	1489/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	2	7	11	13	7	3.40	1313/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	3	4	9	7	7	3.37	1477/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	10	11	15	4.00	899/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	4	4	8	3	3.40	1312/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	4	3	6	14	16	3.81	1254/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	30	4.68	938/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	5	13	11	4	3.42	1406/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	10	12	20	4.09	1288/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	5	8	28	4.42	1341/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	5	15	13	5	3.24	1465/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	4	5	13	12	7	3.32	1448/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	5	1	7	14	9	3.58	1099/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	6	10	12	5	3.22	1242/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	0	11	8	14	3.76	1141/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	10	12	9	3.61	1206/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	4	8	10	7	3.69	745/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	4	10	16	11	3.58	1476/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	4	16	13	8	3.43	1489/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	2	7	11	13	7	3.40	1313/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	3	4	9	7	7	3.37	1477/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	10	11	15	4.00	899/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	4	4	8	3	3.40	1312/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	4	3	6	14	16	3.81	1254/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	30	4.68	938/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	2	2	14	8	3	3.28	1456/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	2	5	4	15	4.11	1273/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	1278/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	2	3	7	9	3	3.33	1446/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	4	8	6	2	3.00	1489/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	2	3	2	6	3	7	3.43	1184/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	6	10	12	5	3.22	1242/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	0	11	8	14	3.76	1141/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	10	12	9	3.61	1206/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	4	8	10	7	3.69	745/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schmitt,Daniell</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	4	10	16	11	3.58	1476/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	4	16	13	8	3.43	1489/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	2	7	11	13	7	3.40	1313/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	3	4	9	7	7	3.37	1477/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	10	11	15	4.00	899/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	4	4	8	3	3.40	1312/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	4	3	6	14	16	3.81	1254/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	30	4.68	938/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	4	12	9	4.20	754/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	1319/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	1421/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1238/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1288/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	1	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	****/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	6	10	12	5	3.22	1242/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	0	11	8	14	3.76	1141/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	10	12	9	3.61	1206/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	4	8	10	7	3.69	745/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schmitt,Daniell</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schmitt,Daniell</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 102 04	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	73
<b>Title:</b>	Prin Of Chemistry II		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	47
<b>Instructor:</b>	Bass,Sarah			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	4	10	16	11	3.58	1476/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	4	16	13	8	3.43	1489/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	2	7	11	13	7	3.40	1313/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	3	4	9	7	7	3.37	1477/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	10	11	15	4.00	899/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	1	4	4	8	3	3.40	1312/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	4	3	6	14	16	3.81	1254/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	30	4.68	938/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	34	2	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	****/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	39	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	****/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	39	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	39	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	****/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	****/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	41	1	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	6	10	12	5	3.22	1242/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	0	11	8	14	3.76	1141/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	10	12	9	3.61	1206/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	4	8	10	7	3.69	745/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,Sarah</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>47</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	3	10	16	15	3.73	1410/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	14	23	9	3.77	1348/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	12	16	12	3.68	1240/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	3	7	12	9	9	3.35	1479/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	3	5	21	13	3.84	1076/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	5	2	9	9	9	3.44	1294/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	11	11	23	4.10	1005/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	7	37	4.76	806/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	5	9	17	7	3.62	1312/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	6	12	24	4.15	1252/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	14	30	4.47	1296/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	11	16	15	3.77	1324/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	9	11	20	3.83	1300/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	3	8	16	14	3.73	1014/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	3	8	11	10	3.30	1215/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	2	10	8	17	3.85	1101/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	3	12	11	12	3.70	1177/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	6	2	7	10	11	3.50	823/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	2	Under-grad	48	Non-major	49
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	3	10	16	15	3.73	1410/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	14	23	9	3.77	1348/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	12	16	12	3.68	1240/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	3	7	12	9	9	3.35	1479/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	3	5	21	13	3.84	1076/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	5	2	9	9	9	3.44	1294/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	11	11	23	4.10	1005/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	7	37	4.76	806/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	2	3	12	13	4	3.41	1411/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	2	1	5	3	20	4.23	1193/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	2	0	2	4	23	4.48	1278/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	2	2	3	10	11	3.93	1238/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	5	3	4	9	7	3.36	1440/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	0	5	0	5	6	8	3.50	1142/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	3	8	11	10	3.30	1215/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	2	10	8	17	3.85	1101/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	3	12	11	12	3.70	1177/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	6	2	7	10	11	3.50	823/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.50



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 102 05	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 72
<b>Title:</b> Prin Of Chemistry II		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 49
<b>Instructor:</b> Hamilton,Diana		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	2	Under-grad	48	Non-major	49
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schmitt,Daniell</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	3	10	16	15	3.73	1410/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	14	23	9	3.77	1348/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	12	16	12	3.68	1240/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	3	7	12	9	9	3.35	1479/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	3	5	21	13	3.84	1076/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	5	2	9	9	9	3.44	1294/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	11	11	23	4.10	1005/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	7	37	4.76	806/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	4	9	15	4	3.59	1323/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	1	2	5	4	14	4.08	1292/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	0	8	8	13	4.07	1470/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	2	9	12	4.20	1035/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	3	3	8	9	3.76	1330/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	3	3	0	3	7	7	3.75	1000/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	3	8	11	10	3.30	1215/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	2	10	8	17	3.85	1101/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	3	12	11	12	3.70	1177/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	6	2	7	10	11	3.50	823/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schmitt,Daniell</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schmitt,Daniell</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	2	Under-grad	48	Non-major	49
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	3	10	16	15	3.73	1410/1589	3.59	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	14	23	9	3.77	1348/1589	3.52	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	12	16	12	3.68	1240/1391	3.41	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	3	7	12	9	9	3.35	1479/1552	3.27	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	3	5	21	13	3.84	1076/1495	3.83	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	5	2	9	9	9	3.44	1294/1457	3.52	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	11	11	23	4.10	1005/1572	3.89	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	7	37	4.76	806/1589	4.80	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	3	6	14	9	3.91	1081/1569	3.51	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	2	2	4	14	4.22	1201/1530	4.08	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	1	0	2	8	18	4.45	1314/1533	4.29	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	2	2	1	5	16	4.19	1042/1528	3.68	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	2	1	6	12	4.04	1156/1529	3.46	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	3	3	0	3	6	8	3.80	965/1393	3.44	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	3	8	11	10	3.30	1215/1337	3.24	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	2	10	8	17	3.85	1101/1331	3.86	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	3	12	11	12	3.70	1177/1333	3.54	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	6	2	7	10	11	3.50	823/1014	3.48	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino, Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	3.52	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,Jacquely</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	3.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	2	Under-grad	48	Non-major	49
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	1057/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	614/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	780/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	652/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	5	4	5	3.53	1295/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	777/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	9	6	4.06	1050/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	280/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	280/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.56
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	434/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	586/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	524/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	993/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	2	3	8	3.94	877/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.94
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	745/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1200/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1259/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	63/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	40/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	22/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	33/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	34/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.53

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	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						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 102L 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	23
<b>Title:</b>	Intro Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	20
<b>Instructor:</b>	Davis,Brittney			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	1057/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	614/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	780/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	652/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	5	4	5	3.53	1295/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	777/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	9	6	4.06	1050/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	280/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	369/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.56
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	541/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1332/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	248/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	984/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.94
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	745/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1200/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1259/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Davis,Brittney</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	63/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	40/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	22/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	33/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	34/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.53

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	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						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	957/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	467/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	874/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1081/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	899/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1078/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	4	5	6	3.58	1378/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	787/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	886/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.05
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	610/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	614/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	377/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	3	11	4.28	984/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	4	1	11	4.29	551/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1123/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	4	1	5	3.58	1203/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	926/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	944/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 03		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 23					
Title: Intro Chemistry Lab I									Questionnaires: 20					
Instructor: Tyminski, Frank														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	113/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	110/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	83/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	69/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.62
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	96/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.15
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 102L 03	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	23
<b>Title:</b>	Intro Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	20
<b>Instructor:</b>	Kohnhorst,Casey			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	957/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	467/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	874/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1081/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	899/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1078/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	4	5	6	3.58	1378/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	787/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	957/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.05
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	586/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	195/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	586/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	185/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1123/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	4	1	5	3.58	1203/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	926/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	944/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 03		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 23				
Title: Intro Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 20				
Instructor: Kohnhorst, Casey														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	113/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	110/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	83/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	69/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.62
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	96/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.15
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst, Casey</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1391/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	943/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	799/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	636/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	508/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1024/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	121/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	992/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1125/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	346/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	281/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	852/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	124/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.80
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	337/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1176/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1300/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	146/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	103/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	116/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	109/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	135/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	3.60

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Saha Ray,Arun</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1391/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	943/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	799/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	636/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	508/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1024/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	121/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	992/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	957/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1389/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	909/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	924/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.80
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	337/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1176/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1300/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Saha Ray,Arun</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	146/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	103/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	116/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	109/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	135/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	3.60

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	1099/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	922/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	828/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	932/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	587/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	804/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1277/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	787/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	886/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.05
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	259/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	352/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	509/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	558/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	409/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	759/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	379/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	965/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	110/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	110/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	52/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	59/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	50/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	35/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.50
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 102L 05	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 24
<b>Title:</b> Intro Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 18
<b>Instructor:</b> Tyminski, Frank		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Davis,Brittney</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	1099/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	922/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	828/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	932/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	587/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	804/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1277/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	787/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	957/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.05
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	677/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	1421/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	817/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	0	3	8	4.14	1097/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	2	3	0	6	3.91	912/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	759/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	379/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	965/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	110/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	4.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Davis,Brittney</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	110/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	52/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	59/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	50/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	35/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.50
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 102L 05	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 24
<b>Title:</b> Intro Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 18
<b>Instructor:</b> Davis,Brittney		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1182/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	1044/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	6	3	5	3.73	1219/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	7	5	6	3.79	1281/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	834/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	854/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	5	3	6	3.40	1439/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	768/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	682/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	610/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	757/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	670/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	1151/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	629/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	100/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	31/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	59/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	75/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	26/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,Anand</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1182/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	1044/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	6	3	5	3.73	1219/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	7	5	6	3.79	1281/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	834/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	854/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	5	3	6	3.40	1439/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	768/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	7	4	3	3.60	1319/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	1153/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1305/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	869/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1306/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,Anand</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	100/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	31/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	59/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	75/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	26/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	3	7	3.74	1404/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	933/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1021/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1210/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	899/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	3	4	6	3.81	1078/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1095/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	882/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	754/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.22
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	887/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	1047/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	768/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	1151/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	510/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.07
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1021/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	824/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1203/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	875/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.40

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	133/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	106/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	143/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	122/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	61/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.36
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst,Casey</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	3	7	3.74	1404/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	933/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1021/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1210/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	899/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	3	4	6	3.81	1078/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1095/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	882/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	718/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.22
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1095/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1407/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1096/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1424/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	965/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.07
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1021/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	824/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1203/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	875/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.40

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst,Casey</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	133/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	106/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	143/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	122/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	61/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.36
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst, Casey</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1249/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1121/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	7	3	3	3.69	1235/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	6	8	3	3.67	1352/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1047/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	7	5	3.83	1060/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	995/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	519/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	682/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	1	14	4.56	816/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1100/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	768/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1121/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	324/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	601/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1007/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 102L 08	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	24
<b>Title:</b>	Intro Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	21
<b>Instructor:</b>	Tyminski, Frank			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	82/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	82/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	119/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	115/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	1	6	7	4.13	100/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.13
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Santhanam,Nithy</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1249/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1121/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	7	3	3	3.69	1235/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	6	8	3	3.67	1352/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1047/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	7	5	3.83	1060/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	995/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	519/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	9	3	3	3.60	1319/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1130/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1495/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	949/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1294/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	743/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	601/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1007/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Santhanam,Nithy</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	82/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	82/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	119/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	115/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	1	6	7	4.13	100/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.13
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Santhanam,Nithy</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	1432/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	2	6	3	3.25	1527/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	2	2	5	0	3.10	1357/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	3	4	3	2	3.00	1518/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1342/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1369/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	3	4	4	3.44	1429/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	938/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1256/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	1201/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	1261/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	1026/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1406/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1057/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1315/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1284/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	1318/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,Anand</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	1432/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	2	6	3	3.25	1527/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	2	2	5	0	3.10	1357/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	3	4	3	2	3.00	1518/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1342/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1369/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	3	4	4	3.44	1429/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	938/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	4	1	3.55	1347/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1130/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	1476/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1117/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1388/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	796/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1315/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1284/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	1318/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,Anand</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,Anand</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	832/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	555/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1061/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1268/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	673/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	1	5	3.82	1078/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	0	5	3.64	1350/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1074/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	694/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	1223/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	0	8	4.18	1448/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	3.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1117/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1133/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	3	0	3	3.33	1222/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	2.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1117/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	989/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1080/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	903/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.29

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 10		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Intro Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 12				
Instructor: Tyminski, Frank														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	172/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	93/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	168/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	164/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	105/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	60/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	2.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	63/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	62/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	2.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	28/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	27/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	3.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	30/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	3.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	30/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	3.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	20/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	2.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	32/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	2.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Saha Ray,Arun</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	832/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	555/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1061/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1268/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	673/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	1	5	3.82	1078/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	0	5	3.64	1350/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1074/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	369/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1237/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1513/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	3.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1482/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1406/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1377/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	2.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1117/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	989/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1080/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	903/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	3.29

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 10		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Intro Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 12				
Instructor: Saha Ray,Arun														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	172/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	93/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	168/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	164/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	105/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	60/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	2.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	63/65	3.00	3.45	4.43	4.13	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	62/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	2.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	28/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	27/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	3.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	30/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	3.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	30/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	3.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	20/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	2.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	32/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	2.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Saha Ray,Arun</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1068/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1053/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1250/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	1518/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1067/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1391/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1378/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	559/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	405/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	974/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	796/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	823/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1328/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1327/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 11		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 11				
Title: Intro Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 7				
Instructor: Tyminski, Frank														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	113/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	59/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	35/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 102L 11	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 11
<b>Title:</b> Intro Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 7
<b>Instructor:</b> Tyminski, Frank		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Santhanam,Nithy</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1068/1589	4.01	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1053/1589	4.20	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1250/1391	3.95	3.99	4.34	4.29	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	1518/1552	3.81	3.82	4.25	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1067/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1391/1457	3.79	3.70	4.15	3.99	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1378/1572	3.84	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1589	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	596/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1530	4.58	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.43	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	924/1529	4.08	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1393	4.02	3.78	4.06	3.99	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	823/1337	3.85	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1328/1331	3.61	3.90	4.35	4.18	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1327/1333	3.43	3.73	4.40	4.22	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	3.62	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 11		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 11				
Title: Intro Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 7				
Instructor: Santhanam,Nithy														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	113/180	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.25	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	59/194	4.40	4.20	4.17	4.36	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/178	4.48	4.49	4.47	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/181	4.50	4.41	4.40	4.54	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	35/165	4.27	4.03	4.12	4.37	4.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	2.67	3.79	4.46	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	2.67	3.53	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	3.98	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.33	3.33	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	3.67	3.67	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	3.33	3.33	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	2.67	2.67	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	2.67	2.67	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 102L 11	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 11
<b>Title:</b> Intro Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 7
<b>Instructor:</b> Santhanam,Nithy		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 123 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic &amp; Biochem I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>69</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	9	10	48	4.54	595/1589	4.54	4.03	4.32	4.20	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	17	46	4.60	467/1589	4.60	4.03	4.29	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	12	14	38	4.26	865/1391	4.26	3.99	4.34	4.29	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	2	7	13	32	4.39	693/1552	4.39	3.82	4.25	4.16	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	27	4	3	5	12	17	3.85	1067/1495	3.85	3.91	4.14	4.07	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	3	0	4	7	25	4.31	629/1457	4.31	3.70	4.15	3.99	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	11	53	4.72	267/1572	4.72	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	3	48	15	4.13	1445/1589	4.13	4.65	4.66	4.59	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	1	0	0	14	37	4.65	249/1569	4.65	3.79	4.13	4.08	4.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	8	53	4.78	434/1530	4.78	4.39	4.49	4.45	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	61	4.94	410/1533	4.94	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	15	46	4.66	494/1528	4.66	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	8	52	4.76	382/1529	4.76	4.02	4.36	4.31	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	40	2	4	2	3	12	3.83	954/1393	3.83	3.78	4.06	3.99	3.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	2	1	7	8	16	4.03	813/1337	4.03	3.69	4.17	4.01	4.03
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	1	0	4	7	23	4.46	669/1331	4.46	3.90	4.35	4.18	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	2	0	4	7	22	4.34	824/1333	4.34	3.73	4.40	4.22	4.34

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 123 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 104
<b>Title:</b> Gen Organic & Biochem I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 69
<b>Instructor:</b> Tracy,Allison M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	35	27	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	3.91	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	52	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	19	General	1	Under-grad	69	Non-major	69
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	12						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cullum,Brian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	9	10	4.08	1124/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	8	9	4.00	1151/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	8	4.08	1016/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	7	8	6	3.82	1105/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1312/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	774/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	234/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	9	7	5	3.73	1233/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	4.08
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	644/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	5	0	18	4.46	1305/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	4	13	4.21	1035/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	739/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	3	5	8	3.94	865/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	7	10	3.88	944/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	824/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	4	6	9	3.83	1113/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	530/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.06

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cullum,Brian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	96/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.19
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	54/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	18/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	96/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	49/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 1	Other	0				
			? 4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	9	10	4.08	1124/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	8	9	4.00	1151/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	8	4.08	1016/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	7	8	6	3.82	1105/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1312/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	774/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	234/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	1081/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	4.08
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	858/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	1378/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	1081/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	993/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1240/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	7	10	3.88	944/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	824/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	4	6	9	3.83	1113/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	530/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.06

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	96/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.19
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	54/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	18/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	96/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	49/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 300 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	27
<b>Title:</b>	Analytical Chemistry		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	24
<b>Instructor:</b>	Gray,Andrea			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	9	10	4.08	1124/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	8	9	4.00	1151/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	8	4.08	1016/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	7	8	6	3.82	1105/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1312/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	774/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	234/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	411/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	4.08
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	346/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	843/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	282/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	7	10	3.88	944/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	824/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	4	6	9	3.83	1113/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	530/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.06

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gray,Andrea</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	96/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.19
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	54/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	18/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	96/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	49/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Scott</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	9	10	4.08	1124/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	8	9	4.00	1151/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	8	4.08	1016/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1421/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	7	8	6	3.82	1105/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1312/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	774/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	234/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	4	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	754/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	4.08
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	644/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	586/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	282/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	7	10	3.88	944/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	824/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	4	6	9	3.83	1113/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	530/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.06

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Scott</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	96/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.19
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	54/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	18/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	96/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	49/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 1	Other	0				
			? 4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 300 03	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	26
<b>Title:</b>	Analytical Chemistry		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	21
<b>Instructor:</b>	Cullum,Brian M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	13	4.29	929/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	1	7	8	3.81	1326/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	12	4.05	1038/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1294/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	4	11	4.16	794/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1051/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	540/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	598/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	5	3	5	3.50	1367/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	470/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	1	4	11	3.95	1488/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	2	2	12	3.86	1283/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	1129/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	0	3	1	9	3.65	1067/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.45
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	1	0	6	7	3.61	1086/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	2	0	13	4.17	899/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	3	2	9	3.83	1107/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	395/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cullum,Brian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	66/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	71/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	39/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	66/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	59/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.38
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	13	4.29	929/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	1	7	8	3.81	1326/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	12	4.05	1038/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1294/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	4	11	4.16	794/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1051/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	540/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	598/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1098/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	488/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	1378/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	856/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	600/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	2	2	0	0	4	3.25	1251/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.45
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	1	0	6	7	3.61	1086/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	2	0	13	4.17	899/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	3	2	9	3.83	1107/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	395/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	66/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	71/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	39/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	66/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	59/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.38
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 03		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 26				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 21				
Instructor: Gray,Andrea														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	13	4.29	929/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	1	7	8	3.81	1326/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	12	4.05	1038/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1294/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	4	11	4.16	794/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1051/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	540/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	598/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	902/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	816/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1140/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	756/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	739/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.45
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	1	0	6	7	3.61	1086/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	2	0	13	4.17	899/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	3	2	9	3.83	1107/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	395/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gray,Andrea</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	66/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	71/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	39/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	66/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	59/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.38
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 03		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 26				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 21				
Instructor: Barannikova,Evg														
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	13	4.29	929/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	1	7	8	3.81	1326/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	12	4.05	1038/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1294/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	4	11	4.16	794/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1051/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	540/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	598/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	559/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	259/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	843/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	391/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	586/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.45
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	1	0	6	7	3.61	1086/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	2	0	13	4.17	899/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	3	2	9	3.83	1107/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	395/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Barannikova,Evg</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	66/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	71/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	39/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	66/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	59/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.38
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cullum,Brian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1047/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	6	6	3.83	1308/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	954/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1314/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	899/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	3	0	2	2.89	1431/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	1277/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1043/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	644/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	1389/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	4	9	4.22	1017/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	1081/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	3	4	2	3	3.23	1257/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1009/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	532/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	939/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	491/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cullum,Brian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	152/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	0	2	5	6	3.69	164/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	90/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	170/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	6	1	0	4	5	3.06	156/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.06
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cullum,Brian M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 1	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 2	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1047/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	6	6	3.83	1308/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	954/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1314/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	899/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	3	0	2	2.89	1431/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	1277/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	7	6	0	3.19	1479/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	745/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	1372/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1461/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1325/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1195/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1009/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	532/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	939/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	491/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 04		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 27				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor: Mang, Stephen A.														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	152/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	0	2	5	6	3.69	164/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	90/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	170/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	6	1	0	4	5	3.06	156/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.06
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 1	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 2	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 300 04	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	27
<b>Title:</b>	Analytical Chemistry		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	18
<b>Instructor:</b>	Riley,Scott			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1047/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	6	6	3.83	1308/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	954/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1314/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	899/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	3	0	2	2.89	1431/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	1277/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1134/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	644/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	959/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1009/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	532/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	939/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	491/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 04		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 27				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor: Riley,Scott														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	152/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	0	2	5	6	3.69	164/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	90/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	170/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	6	1	0	4	5	3.06	156/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.06
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Scott</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	2	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 04		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 27				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor: Barannikova,Evg														
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1047/1589	4.18	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	6	6	3.83	1308/1589	3.88	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	954/1391	4.10	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1314/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	899/1495	3.99	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	3	0	2	2.89	1431/1457	3.38	3.70	4.15	4.13	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	1277/1572	4.19	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1201/1569	3.91	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1095/1530	4.66	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	959/1533	4.54	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1528	4.32	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1529	4.42	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1393	3.46	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1009/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	532/1331	4.34	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	939/1333	3.94	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	491/1014	4.14	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 04		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 27				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor: Barannikova,Evg														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	152/180	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	0	2	5	6	3.69	164/194	4.22	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	90/178	4.80	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	170/181	4.26	4.41	4.40	4.31	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	6	1	0	4	5	3.06	156/165	3.96	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.06
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Barannikova,Evg</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	2	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 301 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Physical Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arnold,Bradley</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>37</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	28	4.68	421/1589	4.68	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	292/1589	4.76	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	301/1391	4.76	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	588/1552	4.45	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	7	11	15	4.06	871/1495	4.06	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	1	10	15	4.44	465/1457	4.44	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	31	4.78	210/1572	4.78	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	280/1589	4.94	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	1	10	18	4.47	425/1569	4.47	3.79	4.13	4.10	4.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	259/1530	4.89	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	527/1533	4.92	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	26	4.69	434/1528	4.69	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	29	4.75	397/1529	4.75	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	4	9	7	7	3.45	1173/1393	3.45	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.45
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1337	****	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1331	****	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1333	****	3.73	4.40	4.41	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 301 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 76
<b>Title:</b> Physical Chemistry I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 37
<b>Instructor:</b> Arnold,Bradley		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	31	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	1	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	23
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 311L 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	30
<b>Title:</b>	Advanced Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	9
<b>Instructor:</b>	Mang, Stephen A.			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1182/1589	4.06	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1348/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1352/1552	3.85	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1474/1495	3.12	3.91	4.14	4.11	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	593/1457	4.30	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	995/1572	3.76	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	787/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1125/1569	3.53	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.51
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	644/1530	4.33	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1181/1533	4.47	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1035/1528	4.01	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1174/1529	3.88	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1311/1393	3.07	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	663/1337	4.25	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1284/1331	3.00	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	547/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	180/1014	4.67	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.67
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	160/180	3.86	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	142/194	4.06	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	143/178	3.83	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	111/181	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	124/165	3.71	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dahal,Sudhir</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1182/1589	4.06	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1348/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1352/1552	3.85	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1474/1495	3.12	3.91	4.14	4.11	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	593/1457	4.30	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	995/1572	3.76	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	787/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1462/1569	3.53	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	663/1337	4.25	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1284/1331	3.00	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	547/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	180/1014	4.67	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.67
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	160/180	3.86	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	142/194	4.06	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	143/178	3.83	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	111/181	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.38

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dahal,Sudhir</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	124/165	3.71	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 1	Required for Majors	8 Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	0 Under-grad 9 Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Strobbia,Pietro</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1182/1589	4.06	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1348/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1352/1552	3.85	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1474/1495	3.12	3.91	4.14	4.11	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	593/1457	4.30	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	995/1572	3.76	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	787/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1319/1569	3.53	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.51
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1530	4.33	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1533	4.47	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1528	4.01	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1529	3.88	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1393	3.07	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	663/1337	4.25	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1284/1331	3.00	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	547/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	180/1014	4.67	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.67
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	160/180	3.86	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Strobbia,Pietro</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	142/194	4.06	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	143/178	3.83	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	111/181	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	124/165	3.71	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Languirand, Eric</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1182/1589	4.06	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1348/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1352/1552	3.85	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1474/1495	3.12	3.91	4.14	4.11	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	593/1457	4.30	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	995/1572	3.76	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	787/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1438/1569	3.53	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.51
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1530	4.33	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1533	4.47	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1528	4.01	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1529	3.88	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1393	3.07	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	663/1337	4.25	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1284/1331	3.00	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	547/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	180/1014	4.67	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.67
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	160/180	3.86	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Languirand, Eric</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	142/194	4.06	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	143/178	3.83	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	111/181	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	124/165	3.71	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 311L 03	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Title:</b>	Advanced Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	Mang, Stephen A.			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	3	2	9	11	4.12	1089/1589	4.06	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	12	5	3.76	1356/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1171/1391	3.86	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	10	9	4.04	1052/1552	3.85	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	6	8	4	3.52	1295/1495	3.12	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	670/1457	4.30	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	2	6	8	5	3.42	1435/1572	3.76	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	768/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	5	9	7	3.87	1116/1569	3.53	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	1319/1530	4.33	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	1389/1533	4.47	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	6	10	5	3.82	1305/1528	4.01	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	4	7	7	3.76	1330/1529	3.88	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	1	4	4	2	3	3.14	1286/1393	3.07	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1337	4.25	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1331	3.00	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1014	4.67	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	93/180	3.86	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	93/194	4.06	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	3	2	11	6	3.67	165/178	3.83	4.49	4.47	4.42	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	1	7	14	4.29	119/181	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	3	5	9	6	3.67	130/165	3.71	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.67
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	16
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	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						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 311L 03	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Title:</b>	Advanced Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	Dahal,Sudhir			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	3	2	9	11	4.12	1089/1589	4.06	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	12	5	3.76	1356/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1171/1391	3.86	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	10	9	4.04	1052/1552	3.85	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	6	8	4	3.52	1295/1495	3.12	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	670/1457	4.30	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	2	6	8	5	3.42	1435/1572	3.76	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	768/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	4	1	1	7	6	0	3.20	1476/1569	3.53	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1530	4.33	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1533	4.47	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1528	4.01	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1529	3.88	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.76
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1337	4.25	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1331	3.00	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1014	4.67	3.69	4.05	4.04	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	93/180	3.86	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.22

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dahal,Sudhir</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	93/194	4.06	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	3	2	11	6	3.67	165/178	3.83	4.49	4.47	4.42	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	1	7	14	4.29	119/181	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	3	5	9	6	3.67	130/165	3.71	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.67
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	16
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	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						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Strobbia,Pietro</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	3	2	9	11	4.12	1089/1589	4.06	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	12	5	3.76	1356/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1171/1391	3.86	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	10	9	4.04	1052/1552	3.85	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	6	8	4	3.52	1295/1495	3.12	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	670/1457	4.30	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	2	6	8	5	3.42	1435/1572	3.76	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	768/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	4	1	0	6	9	0	3.44	1401/1569	3.53	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1530	4.33	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1533	4.47	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1528	4.01	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1529	3.88	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.76
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1337	4.25	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1331	3.00	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1014	4.67	3.69	4.05	4.04	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	93/180	3.86	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.22

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Strobbia,Pietro</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	93/194	4.06	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	3	2	11	6	3.67	165/178	3.83	4.49	4.47	4.42	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	1	7	14	4.29	119/181	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	3	5	9	6	3.67	130/165	3.71	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.67
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	16
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	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						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 311L 03	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	31
<b>Title:</b>	Advanced Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	27
<b>Instructor:</b>	Languirand, Eric			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	3	2	9	11	4.12	1089/1589	4.06	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	12	5	3.76	1356/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	18	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1171/1391	3.86	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	10	9	4.04	1052/1552	3.85	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	6	8	4	3.52	1295/1495	3.12	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	670/1457	4.30	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	2	6	8	5	3.42	1435/1572	3.76	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	768/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	4	1	0	4	8	2	3.67	1277/1569	3.53	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1530	4.33	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1533	4.47	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1528	4.01	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1529	3.88	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.76
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1337	4.25	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1331	3.00	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1014	4.67	3.69	4.05	4.04	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	93/180	3.86	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.22

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 311L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Languirand, Eric</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	93/194	4.06	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	3	2	11	6	3.67	165/178	3.83	4.49	4.47	4.42	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	1	7	14	4.29	119/181	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	3	5	9	6	3.67	130/165	3.71	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.67
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	16
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	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						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch,Tiffan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>236</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>142</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	5	29	104	4.66	449/1589	4.72	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	12	29	98	4.58	496/1589	4.67	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	9	11	43	78	4.35	790/1391	4.40	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	37	0	3	14	21	66	4.44	604/1552	4.44	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	8	31	99	4.64	273/1495	4.68	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	64	1	4	8	14	49	4.39	521/1457	4.40	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	9	27	100	4.61	378/1572	4.58	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	1	0	0	19	117	4.83	651/1589	4.85	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	1	2	4	30	80	4.59	304/1569	4.64	3.79	4.13	4.10	4.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	2	2	16	115	4.78	452/1530	4.85	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	1	3	129	4.92	527/1533	4.93	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	8	33	93	4.58	595/1528	4.69	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	15	25	92	4.52	726/1529	4.66	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	20	1	6	13	27	66	4.34	510/1393	4.42	3.78	4.06	4.10	4.34
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	109	0	2	0	7	6	18	4.15	****/1337	4.06	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	107	0	1	3	5	7	19	4.14	****/1331	4.39	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	108	0	0	2	2	12	18	4.35	****/1333	4.57	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	107	12	1	2	2	3	15	4.26	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch, Tiffan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>236</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>142</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	140	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	140	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	140	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	140	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	140	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	3.94	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	140	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	140	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	140	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	140	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	140	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	140	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	140	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	141	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	141	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	141	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	141	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	141	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	141	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch,Tiffan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>236</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>142</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	141	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	141	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	43	Required for Majors	119	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	26	1.00-1.99	0	B	57						
56-83	21	2.00-2.99	9	C	22	General	2	Under-grad	142	Non-major	138
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	49	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	14						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch,Tiffan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>108</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	13	89	4.79	278/1589	4.72	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	12	88	4.76	292/1589	4.67	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	8	24	69	4.46	666/1391	4.40	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	33	0	3	9	14	47	4.44	620/1552	4.44	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	7	15	83	4.72	204/1495	4.68	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	56	0	0	9	12	29	4.40	509/1457	4.40	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	20	75	4.56	441/1572	4.58	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	0	11	90	4.86	572/1589	4.85	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	2	26	68	4.69	226/1569	4.64	3.79	4.13	4.10	4.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	98	4.91	201/1530	4.85	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	99	4.94	352/1533	4.93	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	13	88	4.80	281/1528	4.69	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	11	89	4.81	321/1529	4.66	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	13	3	1	5	19	59	4.49	357/1393	4.42	3.78	4.06	4.10	4.49
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	2	4	11	13	4.06	793/1337	4.06	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	0	2	3	7	19	4.39	729/1331	4.39	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	78	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	649/1333	4.57	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	78	11	1	0	6	4	8	3.95	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch, Tiffan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>108</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	103	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	103	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	103	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	103	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	103	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	****/165	****	4.03	4.12	3.94	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	104	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	104	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	105	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	105	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	105	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	106	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	106	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	106	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	106	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	106	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	105	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	105	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	105	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch,Tiffan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>108</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	105	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	105	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 33	Required for Majors 89	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 36		
56-83	19	2.00-2.99 8	C 19	General 0	Under-grad 108 Non-major 105
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 11	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 33	F 0	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 14		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1182/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1378/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1212/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1218/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1239/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	4	4	3.67	1194/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1323/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	9	0	3.50	1367/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	1296/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	1462/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	8	6	4.13	1096/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1227/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	0	7	5	4.00	796/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1204/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1271/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1271/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 17				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	5	6	4	3.81	144/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	121/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	140/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	141/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	105/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,Christ</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1182/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1378/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1212/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1218/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1239/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	4	4	3.67	1194/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1323/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	957/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1095/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1361/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	974/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1378/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1361/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1204/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1271/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1271/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 17				
Instructor: Toonstra,Christ														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	5	6	4	3.81	144/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	121/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	140/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	141/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	105/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,Christ</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	11	3	4.00	1182/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1072/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1131/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	4	3	3.44	1454/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	2	8	3.94	983/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1033/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	5	3.75	1287/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	703/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	957/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	610/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	959/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	8	7	4.25	992/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	883/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	877/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.66
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	944/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1257/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1150/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	429/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.20

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	136/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	115/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	112/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	105/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	119/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.86

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
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				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 03		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Schoukroun,Laur														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	11	3	4.00	1182/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1072/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1131/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	4	3	3.44	1454/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	2	8	3.94	983/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1033/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	5	3.75	1287/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	703/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1367/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1409/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1467/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1255/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1306/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1206/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.66
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	944/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1257/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1150/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	429/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	4.20

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schoukroun,Laur</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	136/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	115/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	112/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	105/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	119/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.86

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
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				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1271/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1109/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1250/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1235/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	899/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1104/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	1	3	3.07	1500/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	373/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1143/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.97
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1237/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	1197/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1246/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1294/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	4	1	1	5	3.64	1073/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	4.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	639/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1252/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1279/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 04		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 14				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	133/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	149/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	67/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	83/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	61/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.36
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,Ester</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1271/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1109/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1250/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1235/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	899/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1104/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	1	3	3.07	1500/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	373/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	879/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.97
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1050/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	671/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	607/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	883/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	4.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	639/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1252/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1279/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,Ester</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	133/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	149/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	67/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	83/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	61/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.36
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,Ester</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 05		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 14				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	995/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	1	5	3.69	1405/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1061/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1081/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	587/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	777/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	1032/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	598/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	6	1	3.62	1312/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.77
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	1201/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	907/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1393/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1142/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1120/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1173/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	766/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1124/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	86/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	155/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	89/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	44/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	136/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.57
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Maharjan,Sadika</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	995/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	1	5	3.69	1405/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1061/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1081/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	587/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	777/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	1032/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	598/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	1056/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.77
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1319/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1468/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1333/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1138/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	949/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1173/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	766/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1124/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Maharjan,Sadika</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	86/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	155/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	89/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	44/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	136/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.57
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	6	5	3.75	1391/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1284/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1331/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	3	5	3	3.33	1483/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	7	3	3.69	1203/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	886/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1161/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	677/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1043/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.88
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	1201/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	1332/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1319/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	1	3	7	3.79	1321/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	959/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.71
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1333/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1317/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1300/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 06		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 17				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	76/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	115/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	143/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	145/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	100/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.13
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### 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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shukla,Brahmi</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	6	5	3.75	1391/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1284/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1331/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	3	5	3	3.33	1483/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	7	3	3.69	1203/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	886/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1161/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	677/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1161/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.88
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	1392/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	2	1	1	0	5	3.56	1518/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1324/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1174/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1089/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.71
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1333/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1317/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1300/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 06		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 17				
Instructor: Shukla,Brahmi														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	76/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	115/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	143/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	145/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	100/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.13
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shukla,Brahmi</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### 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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 07		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1479/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	4	3	3.38	1503/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1311/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1409/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	7	1	3.31	1388/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	4	3	3.38	1324/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	3	4	4	3.44	1429/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	703/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	7	3	2	3.38	1422/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	1169/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	1323/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	3	4	3.38	1438/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	3	3	3.31	1448/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1067/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.61
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1271/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1299/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1300/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	903/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	3.29

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 07		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	129/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	157/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.77
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	136/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	159/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	3.85
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	141/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 351L 07	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 16
<b>Instructor:</b> Perks,Harry M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 07</b>	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>								<b>Enrollment:</b>		<b>18</b>		
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>									<b>Questionnaires:</b>		<b>16</b>		
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gallagher, Tom</b>													
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1479/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	4	3	3.38	1503/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1311/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1409/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	7	1	3.31	1388/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	4	3	3.38	1324/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	3	4	4	3.44	1429/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	703/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1134/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1319/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	1505/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	4	3	3.43	1428/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1393/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1104/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.61
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1271/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1299/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1300/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	903/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	3.29

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 07		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Gallagher, Tom														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	129/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	157/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.77
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	136/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	159/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	3.85
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	141/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 351L 07	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 16
<b>Instructor:</b> Gallagher, Tom		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	14 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 2 General	0	16 Non-major
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 08		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 14				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1326/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	6	2	3.54	1463/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1265/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1175/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1145/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1222/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1378/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	598/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	3	5	0	3.20	1476/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1319/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	1476/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	5	3	3.58	1391/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1330/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	758/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1253/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1245/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1231/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1006/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	2.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	142/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	149/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	159/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	3.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	145/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	94/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.17
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 351L 08	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 14
<b>Instructor:</b> Perks,Harry M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,Ester</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1326/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	6	2	3.54	1463/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1265/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1175/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1145/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1222/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1378/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	598/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	730/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	887/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	872/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1104/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1129/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	510/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1253/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1245/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1231/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1006/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	2.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,Ester</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	142/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	149/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	159/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	3.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	145/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	94/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.17
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 351L 08	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 14
<b>Instructor:</b> Sesmero,Ester		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	4	3	1	2.83	1572/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	1550/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1323/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1499/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	4	0	3.09	1428/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	3	1	3.00	1411/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	2	1	3.00	1509/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	420/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1508/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.79
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1447/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	1425/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	1	1	5	3.33	1446/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	1498/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1120/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.77
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1117/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1229/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	1288/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	997/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	2.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	113/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	142/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	59/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	126/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	77/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.29
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 351L 09	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	17
<b>Title:</b>	Organic Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	12
<b>Instructor:</b>	Perks,Harry M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,Dan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	4	3	1	2.83	1572/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	1550/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1323/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1499/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	4	0	3.09	1428/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	3	1	3.00	1411/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	2	1	3.00	1509/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	420/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	312/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.79
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	964/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1100/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	322/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	677/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	796/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.77
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1117/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1229/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	1288/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	997/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	2.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,Dan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	113/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	142/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	59/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	126/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	77/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.29
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 351L 09	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 17
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 12
<b>Instructor:</b> Talley,Dan		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	986/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	853/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	979/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	756/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1175/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1033/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	3	6	3.78	1277/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1098/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.74
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	816/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	924/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	3	2	9	3.89	1266/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	1	2	9	3.72	1347/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	7	3	3	3.69	1041/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	127/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	121/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	64/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	132/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	6	1	6	4.00	105/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 10		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor: Shukla,Brahmi														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	986/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	853/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	979/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	756/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1175/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1033/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	3	6	3.78	1277/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	8	5	3	3.59	1328/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.74
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	887/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1407/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	909/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1368/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shukla,Brahmi</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	127/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	121/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	64/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	132/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	6	1	6	4.00	105/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 11		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 17				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	4	5	3.75	1391/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	3	6	3.69	1410/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	5	5	0	3.25	1334/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1409/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	2	4	3	3.29	1396/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1060/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	5	4	3.53	1394/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	8	0	3.54	1352/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.85
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	801/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1154/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	1171/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1306/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	3	2	3	4	3.29	1240/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	131/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	118/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	77/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	55/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	26/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate 0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9					
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	0			
			? 2					

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schoukroun,Laur</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	4	5	3.75	1391/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	3	6	3.69	1410/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	5	5	0	3.25	1334/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1409/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	2	4	3	3.29	1396/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1060/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	5	4	3.53	1394/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	816/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.85
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1016/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1261/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1171/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	956/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1268/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Schoukroun,Laur</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	131/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	118/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	77/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	55/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	26/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	9	3	3.88	1313/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	943/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1176/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1421/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1047/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1240/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1095/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	8	4	0	3.23	1467/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1252/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	1350/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1387/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	8	4	3	3.67	1368/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	5	1	2	3.20	1268/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	142/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	93/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	107/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	79/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.27

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meares,Adam</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	9	3	3.88	1313/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	943/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1176/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1421/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1047/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1240/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1095/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1134/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	559/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1261/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	350/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	629/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meares,Adam</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	142/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	93/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	107/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	79/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.27

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 13		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18					
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 13					
Instructor: Perks,Harry M															
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>General</b>															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course		0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1332/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	1	5	5	2	3.62	1441/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	3	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1328/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1301/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		2	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	899/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		4	1	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1364/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		2	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1190/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	467/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		3	1	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1396/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.89
<b>Lecture</b>															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		2	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1319/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1229/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		2	0	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1346/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		2	0	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1417/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		2	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1120/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.44
<b>Discussion</b>															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1090/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		8	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1121/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		8	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1259/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful		8	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	113/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	138/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	99/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	72/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	141/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,Dan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1332/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	2	3.62	1441/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1328/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1301/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	899/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1364/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1190/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	467/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	596/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.89
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	887/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1221/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	695/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1113/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1222/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.44
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1090/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1121/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1259/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,Dan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	113/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	138/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	99/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	72/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	141/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,Dan</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	7	6	3.88	1306/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	1278/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	6	1	3.19	1344/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	5	7	2	3.44	1454/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	10	2	3.59	1262/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	6	3	3.56	1244/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	5	6	1	2.94	1522/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	2.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	4	8	0	3.36	1432/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.68
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1358/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	1450/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1430/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	6	5	3.53	1402/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	1	4	5	3.31	1230/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.28
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	971/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1231/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	109/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	173/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	43/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	75/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	1	2	2	5	1	3.27	147/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.27
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,Christ</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	7	6	3.88	1306/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	1278/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	6	1	3.19	1344/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	5	7	2	3.44	1454/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	10	2	3.59	1262/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	6	3	3.56	1244/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	5	6	1	2.94	1522/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	2.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	957/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.68
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1130/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1476/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	1129/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	1142/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1251/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.28
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	971/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1231/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 14		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 18					
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I									Questionnaires: 17					
Instructor: Toonstra,Christ														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	109/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	173/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	43/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	75/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	1	2	2	5	1	3.27	147/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.27
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,Christ</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 15		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1182/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1151/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1235/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1409/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	983/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1205/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	8	6	0	3.27	1472/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	6	9	0	3.44	1401/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	887/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	671/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	1229/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1227/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	748/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	4.12
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	823/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1176/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1007/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	911/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	3.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	129/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	101/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	99/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	77/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	105/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gallagher, Tom</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1182/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1151/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1235/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1409/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	983/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1205/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	8	6	0	3.27	1472/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	327/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1116/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	801/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	1425/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1035/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	924/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	697/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	4.12
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	823/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1176/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1007/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	911/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	3.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gallagher, Tom</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	129/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	101/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	99/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	77/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	105/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other 0		
			? 1			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	1319/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	5	2	3.40	1497/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	3	0	4	2	3.09	1357/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	3	3.60	1381/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1130/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	3	4	2	3.42	1307/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	2	4	3	3.36	1451/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	373/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	4	4	0	3.00	1508/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.31
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1402/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	1261/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1455/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	4	1	3.21	1466/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1041/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.76
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 16		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 15				
Instructor: Perks, Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	106/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	158/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	99/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	126/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	152/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.14
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 351L 16	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 15
<b>Instructor:</b> Perks,Harry M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meares,Adam</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	1319/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	5	2	3.40	1497/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	3	0	4	2	3.09	1357/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	3	3.60	1381/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1130/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	3	4	2	3.42	1307/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	2	4	3	3.36	1451/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	373/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	0	5	1	3.63	1305/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.31
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1050/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1425/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1081/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1081/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	949/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.76
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 16		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 15				
Instructor: Meares,Adam														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	106/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	158/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	99/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	126/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	152/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.14
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 351L 16	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab I		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 15
<b>Instructor:</b> Meares,Adam		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1271/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1393/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	2	6	2	3.46	1304/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	3	1	4	4	3.54	1409/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1067/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	2	6	1	3.15	1388/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	1	6	3	3.62	1360/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	8	0	3.62	1312/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.52
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	887/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1029/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	1319/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	4	7	4.00	1174/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	888/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.34
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1283/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	3	1	3	2	3.20	1264/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1231/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	944/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 17		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 17				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Perks,Harry M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	158/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.54
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	121/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	56/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	145/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	3	2	1	6	3.62	134/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.62
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	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				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Maharjan,Sadika</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1271/1589	3.84	4.03	4.32	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1393/1589	3.77	4.03	4.29	4.26	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	2	6	2	3.46	1304/1391	3.56	3.99	4.34	4.30	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	3	1	4	4	3.54	1409/1552	3.65	3.82	4.25	4.24	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1067/1495	3.74	3.91	4.14	4.11	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	2	6	1	3.15	1388/1457	3.61	3.70	4.15	4.13	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	1	6	3	3.62	1360/1572	3.56	3.98	4.21	4.18	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	3	5	2	3.42	1411/1569	3.71	3.79	4.13	4.10	3.52
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1378/1530	4.25	4.39	4.49	4.49	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1495/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.75	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	8	2	3.69	1358/1528	3.93	4.08	4.35	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	2	1	6	3.62	1384/1529	3.89	4.02	4.36	4.34	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1353/1393	3.68	3.78	4.06	4.10	3.34
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1283/1337	3.41	3.69	4.17	4.20	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	3	1	3	2	3.20	1264/1331	3.48	3.90	4.35	4.35	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1231/1333	3.44	3.73	4.40	4.41	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	944/1014	3.04	3.69	4.05	4.04	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 17		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 17				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Maharjan, Sadika														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	158/180	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.08	3.54
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	121/194	3.94	4.20	4.17	4.05	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	56/178	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.42	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	145/181	4.32	4.41	4.40	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	3	2	1	6	3.62	134/165	3.90	4.03	4.12	3.94	3.62
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/62	****	3.79	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/65	****	3.45	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	****	3.53	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.60	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/61	****	3.90	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/40	****	3.33	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/40	****	3.67	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/39	****	3.33	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/22	****	2.67	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	2.67	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Maharjan,Sadika</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	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	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	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				
				?	4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 401 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Chem/Stat Thermodynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Wormsbecher,Ric</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	223/1589	4.83	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	200/1589	4.83	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	600/1391	4.50	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	943/1552	4.17	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	309/1495	4.60	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	400/1457	4.50	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	152/1572	4.83	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.65	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	241/1569	4.67	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	346/1530	4.83	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.47	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	479/1528	4.67	4.08	4.35	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	282/1529	4.83	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1000/1393	3.75	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1337	5.00	3.69	4.17	4.36	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	379/1331	4.75	3.90	4.35	4.56	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	438/1333	4.75	3.73	4.40	4.63	4.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 401 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 6
<b>Title:</b> Chem/Stat Thermodynamics		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 6
<b>Instructor:</b> Wormsbecher,Ric		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 3				
Title: Adv Inorg Chem Lab										Questionnaires: 2				
Instructor: Onuta,Marie-Chr														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	646/1589	4.50	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	614/1589	4.50	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.99	4.34	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	509/1552	4.50	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1495	4.00	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	886/1457	4.00	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	3.98	4.21	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.65	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	369/1569	4.50	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.39	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.47	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.08	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	739/1529	4.50	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	349/1393	4.50	3.78	4.06	4.18	4.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1145/1337	3.50	3.69	4.17	4.36	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	5.00	3.90	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	702/1333	4.50	3.73	4.40	4.63	4.50
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	50/180	4.50	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 405L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Inorg Chem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Onuta,Marie-Chr</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>2</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/194	5.00	4.20	4.17	4.27	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/178	5.00	4.49	4.47	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/181	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.37	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/165	5.00	4.03	4.12	4.09	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 405L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Inorg Chem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ghann, William</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>2</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	646/1589	4.50	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	614/1589	4.50	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.99	4.34	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	509/1552	4.50	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1495	4.00	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	886/1457	4.00	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	3.98	4.21	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.65	4.66	4.68	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1145/1337	3.50	3.69	4.17	4.36	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	5.00	3.90	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	702/1333	4.50	3.73	4.40	4.63	4.50
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	50/180	4.50	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/194	5.00	4.20	4.17	4.27	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/178	5.00	4.49	4.47	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/181	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.37	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 405L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Inorg Chem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ghann, William</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>2</b>

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/165	5.00	4.03	4.12	4.09	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 420 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Compuer Appl In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Johnson,Bruce A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	832/1589	4.36	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1267/1589	3.91	4.03	4.29	4.35	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1212/1391	3.75	3.99	4.34	4.46	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	826/1552	4.27	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1284/1495	3.55	3.91	4.14	4.25	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1024/1457	3.88	3.70	4.15	4.30	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	1190/1572	3.91	3.98	4.21	4.28	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	467/1589	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1298/1569	3.64	3.79	4.13	4.22	3.64
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	5	4	4.00	1319/1530	4.00	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1229/1533	4.55	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1255/1528	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.41	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	1133/1529	4.09	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	912/1393	3.91	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.91
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1204/1337	3.33	3.69	4.17	4.36	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1176/1331	3.67	3.90	4.35	4.56	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1007/1333	4.00	3.73	4.40	4.63	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 420 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comupter Appl In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Johnson,Bruce A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	5	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 433 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochem Of Nucleic Acids</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Karpel,R L</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1440/1589	3.67	4.03	4.32	4.46	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1419/1589	3.67	4.03	4.29	4.35	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1250/1391	3.67	3.99	4.34	4.46	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1352/1552	3.67	3.82	4.25	4.37	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1437/1495	3.00	3.91	4.14	4.25	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1457/1457	1.50	3.70	4.15	4.30	1.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	735/1572	4.33	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	956/1589	4.67	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1438/1569	3.33	3.79	4.13	4.22	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1095/1530	4.33	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1100/1533	4.67	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1367/1528	3.67	4.08	4.35	4.41	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1174/1529	4.00	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 433 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochem Of Nucleic Acids</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Karpel,R L</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	796/1393	4.00	3.78	4.06	4.18	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	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	4	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Biochem I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bush,C A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	0	1	13	12	16	4.02	1167/1589	4.02	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	2	6	12	13	9	3.50	1471/1589	3.50	4.03	4.29	4.35	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	3	6	17	6	9	3.29	1329/1391	3.29	3.99	4.34	4.46	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	21	1	6	8	0	5	3.10	1507/1552	3.10	3.82	4.25	4.37	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	2	2	6	8	13	8	3.51	1301/1495	3.51	3.91	4.14	4.25	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	25	1	3	3	4	3	3.36	1332/1457	3.36	3.70	4.15	4.30	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	3	5	6	6	19	3.85	1233/1572	3.85	3.98	4.21	4.28	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	9	31	4.78	787/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	3	16	17	6	3.62	1312/1569	3.14	3.79	4.13	4.22	3.14
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	3	5	14	18	4.10	1284/1530	4.09	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	3	1	10	26	4.39	1355/1533	3.97	4.47	4.75	4.76	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	4	4	7	12	12	3.62	1383/1528	3.42	4.08	4.35	4.41	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	9	10	7	12	3.45	1417/1529	3.42	4.02	4.36	4.44	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	4	4	4	11	6	11	3.44	1173/1393	3.35	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.35
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	5	0	5	1	1	2.42	****/1337	****	3.69	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	****/1331	****	3.90	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	2	3	3	1	3	3.00	****/1333	****	3.73	4.40	4.63	****
4. Were special techniques successful	43	7	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Biochem I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bush,C A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.37	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 33	Graduate 1 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 12	General 1	Under-grad 53 Non-major 49
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 17		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Biochem I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Garcin,Elsa D.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	0	1	13	12	16	4.02	1167/1589	4.02	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	2	6	12	13	9	3.50	1471/1589	3.50	4.03	4.29	4.35	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	3	6	17	6	9	3.29	1329/1391	3.29	3.99	4.34	4.46	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	21	1	6	8	0	5	3.10	1507/1552	3.10	3.82	4.25	4.37	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	2	2	6	8	13	8	3.51	1301/1495	3.51	3.91	4.14	4.25	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	25	1	3	3	4	3	3.36	1332/1457	3.36	3.70	4.15	4.30	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	3	5	6	6	19	3.85	1233/1572	3.85	3.98	4.21	4.28	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	9	31	4.78	787/1589	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	9	8	16	6	3	2.67	1548/1569	3.14	3.79	4.13	4.22	3.14
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	2	9	10	19	4.07	1292/1530	4.09	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	2	6	14	4	14	3.55	1518/1533	3.97	4.47	4.75	4.76	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	5	4	14	9	7	3.23	1465/1528	3.42	4.08	4.35	4.41	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	2	6	14	9	8	3.38	1433/1529	3.42	4.02	4.36	4.44	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	4	4	6	11	7	8	3.25	1251/1393	3.35	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.35
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	5	0	5	1	1	2.42	****/1337	****	3.69	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	****/1331	****	3.90	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	2	3	3	1	3	3.00	****/1333	****	3.73	4.40	4.63	****
4. Were special techniques successful	43	7	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Biochem I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Garcin,Elsa D.</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.05	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.20	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.49	4.47	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.41	4.40	4.37	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 33	Graduate 1 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 12	General 1	Under-grad 53 Non-major 49
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 17		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	316/1589	4.57	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	292/1589	4.80	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	242/1391	4.83	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	238/1552	4.57	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1495	4.21	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	248/1457	4.53	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	409/1572	4.64	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	651/1589	4.69	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	201/1530	4.60	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	843/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	174/1528	4.25	4.08	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	194/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	1286/1393	3.64	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.40
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	29/180	4.70	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	36/194	4.80	4.20	4.17	4.27	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/178	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	24/181	4.80	4.41	4.40	4.37	4.90

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 437L 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 19
<b>Title:</b> Biochemistry Laboratory		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 12
<b>Instructor:</b> Tracy,Allison M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	89/165	4.30	4.03	4.12	4.09	4.20

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Khan,Mohsin</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	316/1589	4.57	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	292/1589	4.80	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	242/1391	4.83	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	238/1552	4.57	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1495	4.21	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	248/1457	4.53	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	409/1572	4.64	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	651/1589	4.69	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	854/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	346/1530	4.60	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	872/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	570/1528	4.25	4.08	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	615/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1057/1393	3.64	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.40
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	29/180	4.70	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	36/194	4.80	4.20	4.17	4.27	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/178	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	24/181	4.80	4.41	4.40	4.37	4.90

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 437L 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 19
<b>Title:</b> Biochemistry Laboratory		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 12
<b>Instructor:</b> Khan,Mohsin		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	89/165	4.30	4.03	4.12	4.09	4.20

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 19				
Title: Biochemistry Laboratory										Questionnaires: 12				
Instructor: Childers,Kennet														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	316/1589	4.57	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	292/1589	4.80	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	242/1391	4.83	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	238/1552	4.57	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1495	4.21	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	248/1457	4.53	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	409/1572	4.64	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	651/1589	4.69	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	957/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1530	4.60	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1425/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1528	4.25	4.08	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1393	3.64	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.40
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	29/180	4.70	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	36/194	4.80	4.20	4.17	4.27	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/178	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	24/181	4.80	4.41	4.40	4.37	4.90

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 437L 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 19
<b>Title:</b> Biochemistry Laboratory		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 12
<b>Instructor:</b> Childers,Kennet		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	89/165	4.30	4.03	4.12	4.09	4.20

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	806/1589	4.57	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	191/1589	4.80	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	213/1391	4.83	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	693/1552	4.57	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1153/1495	4.21	3.91	4.14	4.25	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	533/1457	4.53	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	299/1572	4.64	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1084/1589	4.69	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	149/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.22	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	329/1530	4.60	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	139/1528	4.25	4.08	4.35	4.41	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	600/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.44	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	435/1393	3.64	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1021/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.36	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	989/1331	4.00	3.90	4.35	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	438/1333	4.75	3.73	4.40	4.63	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	29/180	4.70	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	19/194	4.80	4.20	4.17	4.27	4.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	143/178	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	45/181	4.80	4.41	4.40	4.37	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	53/165	4.30	4.03	4.12	4.09	4.40

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,Jodian</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	806/1589	4.57	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	191/1589	4.80	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	213/1391	4.83	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	693/1552	4.57	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1153/1495	4.21	3.91	4.14	4.25	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	533/1457	4.53	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	299/1572	4.64	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1084/1589	4.69	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	1298/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.22	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1416/1530	4.60	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	1468/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	1294/1528	4.25	4.08	4.35	4.41	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1313/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.44	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1222/1393	3.64	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1021/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.36	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	989/1331	4.00	3.90	4.35	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	438/1333	4.75	3.73	4.40	4.63	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,Jodian</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	29/180	4.70	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	19/194	4.80	4.20	4.17	4.27	4.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	143/178	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	45/181	4.80	4.41	4.40	4.37	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	53/165	4.30	4.03	4.12	4.09	4.40

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Childers,Kennet</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	806/1589	4.57	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	191/1589	4.80	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	213/1391	4.83	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	693/1552	4.57	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1153/1495	4.21	3.91	4.14	4.25	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	533/1457	4.53	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	299/1572	4.64	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1084/1589	4.69	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1462/1569	4.12	3.79	4.13	4.22	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1530	4.60	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1522/1533	4.39	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1482/1528	4.25	4.08	4.35	4.41	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	1524/1529	3.98	4.02	4.36	4.44	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1393	3.64	3.78	4.06	4.18	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1021/1337	3.75	3.69	4.17	4.36	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	989/1331	4.00	3.90	4.35	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	438/1333	4.75	3.73	4.40	4.63	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Childers,Kennet</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	29/180	4.70	4.05	4.20	4.31	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	19/194	4.80	4.20	4.17	4.27	4.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	143/178	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	45/181	4.80	4.41	4.40	4.37	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	53/165	4.30	4.03	4.12	4.09	4.40

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 451 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 46				
Title: Mech Of Organic Reaction										Questionnaires: 26				
Instructor: Fishbein,James														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	995/1589	4.22	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	9	7	5	3.61	1446/1589	3.61	4.03	4.29	4.35	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	0	5	10	6	3.78	1201/1391	3.78	3.99	4.34	4.46	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	4	6	8	4	3.55	1405/1552	3.55	3.82	4.25	4.37	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	6	9	4	3	3.09	1429/1495	3.09	3.91	4.14	4.25	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	2	2	6	7	3	3.35	1332/1457	3.35	3.70	4.15	4.30	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	4	8	2	6	3.27	1470/1572	3.27	3.98	4.21	4.28	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1249/1589	4.36	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	9	6	2	3.30	1448/1569	3.30	3.79	4.13	4.22	3.30
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	977/1530	4.43	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	700/1533	4.87	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	7	10	3	3.57	1395/1528	3.57	4.08	4.35	4.41	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	10	8	4.13	1105/1529	4.13	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	19	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/1393	****	3.78	4.06	4.18	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/1337	****	3.69	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/1331	****	3.90	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/1333	****	3.73	4.40	4.63	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 451 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>		<b>Enrollment:</b>	46
<b>Title:</b>	Mech Of Organic Reaction			<b>Questionnaires:</b>	26
<b>Instructor:</b>	Fishbein,James				

  

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	****	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 22
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 24
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 12	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1589	4.81	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	734/1589	4.45	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	846/1391	4.39	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	668/1552	4.53	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	663/1495	4.57	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1457	4.60	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	420/1572	4.62	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1550/1589	4.61	4.65	4.66	4.68	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	596/1569	4.64	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	787/1530	4.82	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533	4.98	4.47	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	405/1528	4.67	4.08	4.35	4.41	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1529	4.83	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	796/1393	4.45	3.78	4.06	4.18	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1337	4.33	3.69	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1331	4.33	3.90	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.63	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	4.25	3.69	4.05	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Lisa A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1589	4.81	4.03	4.32	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	853/1589	4.45	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	600/1391	4.39	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	509/1552	4.53	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1495	4.57	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	400/1457	4.60	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	176/1572	4.62	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1589	4.61	4.65	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1569	4.64	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	346/1530	4.82	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	4.98	4.47	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1528	4.67	4.08	4.35	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	530/1529	4.83	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Lisa A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	510/1393	4.45	3.78	4.06	4.18	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,Ryan J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	204/1589	4.81	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	343/1589	4.45	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	706/1391	4.39	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	436/1552	4.53	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	373/1495	4.57	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	487/1457	4.60	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	616/1572	4.62	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1042/1589	4.61	4.65	4.66	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1569	4.64	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	311/1530	4.82	4.39	4.49	4.56	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	469/1533	4.98	4.47	4.75	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	509/1528	4.67	4.08	4.35	4.41	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	351/1529	4.83	4.02	4.36	4.44	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	236/1393	4.45	3.78	4.06	4.18	4.64
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1066/1337	4.33	3.69	4.17	4.36	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	989/1331	4.33	3.90	4.35	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	832/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.63	4.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,Ryan J</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	823/1014	4.25	3.69	4.05	4.32	3.50

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 8	Non-major 7
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 7		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Allen,Mark Andr</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	435/1589	4.81	4.03	4.32	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	853/1589	4.45	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	799/1391	4.39	3.99	4.34	4.46	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	341/1552	4.53	3.82	4.25	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	148/1495	4.57	3.91	4.14	4.25	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	248/1457	4.60	3.70	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	329/1572	4.62	3.98	4.21	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1589	4.61	4.65	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	155/1569	4.64	3.79	4.13	4.22	4.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1530	4.82	4.39	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	4.98	4.47	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1528	4.67	4.08	4.35	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1529	4.83	4.02	4.36	4.44	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	111/1393	4.45	3.78	4.06	4.18	4.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1337	4.33	3.69	4.17	4.36	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	478/1331	4.33	3.90	4.35	4.56	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1333	4.67	3.73	4.40	4.63	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Allen,Mark Andr</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1014	4.25	3.69	4.05	4.32	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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