Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101 University of Mary
Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD Baltimore Count;
Instructor: OLSON, WENDY Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

34

University of Maryland Page 227
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Comman	Errolustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

						Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did v	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.28	928/1576	4.28	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.28
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	462/1576	4.61	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.61
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	658/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.44
	_	uations reflect		_	0	4	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	218/1520	4.79	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.79
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.50
	_	-		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	594/1434	4.33	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.33
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	339/1547	4.67	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.67
	_	was class cand		ilica	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.89
	-			ching effectiveness	7	1	n	1	0	6	3	4.10	871/1554		3.80	4.10		4.10
J. 110W W	ould you	grade the overa	II ccac	ming cricectveness	,	_	O	_	O	O	,	1.10	071/1331	1.10	3.00	1.10	1.01	1.10
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	568/1488	4.72	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.72
2. Did t	the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.89
3. Was 1	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	500/1489	4.67	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.67
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	170/1277	4.73	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.73
		Discus						•		_	_		004/4050	4				
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	381/1279	4.60	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.60
		_	_	ed to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	559/1270	4.60	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.60
		_		nd open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.60
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssiul		13	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	400/ 878	4.20	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.20
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ıtior	ı									
Q	Taran a d	G., GD3		There are add Greeden				Das		_			m				Ma dana	
Credits	Earnea	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3 - – – –			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	3	Graduate	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 10			_			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	18	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1	_		_			

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 44

SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 228 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 228 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

68 Questionnaires: 44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 229 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	13	12	13	3 64	1396/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	15	10	7		1509/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.14
		-		9	9									
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	6			15	3		1294/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	10	10	11	2		1472/1520	3.12		4.25	4.09	2.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	5	10	6	10		1159/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	5	2	5	9			1372/1434	3.00		4.14	3.94	3.04
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	3	1	3	5	8	14	10	3.58	1316/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	5	9	23	4.49	1103/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.49
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	4	2	18	7	1	2.97	1462/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	0	6	7	12	4.00	1233/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	1263/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	4	0	10	3			1349/1486	3.71	4.04		4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	2	9	4	6		1363/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	2	5	4	1	3			1131/1277				3.91	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	2	5	4	1	3	,	3.13	1131/12//	3.31	3.14	4.03	3.91	3.20
Discussion														
	10	0	-	-1	_	_	0	2 20	1115/1070	2 55	2 00	4 17	2 00	2 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	1	6	9	9		1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	3	7	7	10		1149/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	8	5	6	6	7		1218/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.97
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	768/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	1	0	1	3	1		****/ 379	4.17		4.20	4.15	****
		_	_	-	_	_	_		,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	2	0	0	3 00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
										****	****			****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,			4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
• • •														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41 41	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 382	3.00		4.78	3.86	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	U	U	U	Т	Т	Т	4.00	/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.00	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 68
Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 229 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 44

Title

DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 230 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fr	eane	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	13	12	13	3.64	1396/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	15	10	7	3.14	1509/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	6	9	9	15	3	3.00	1294/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	10	10	11	2	2.97	1472/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	5	10	6	10	3.68	1159/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	5	2	5	9	2		1372/1434	3.00		4.14	3.94	3.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	5	8	14	10		1316/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	5	9	23		1103/1574	4.50		4.64	4.59	4.49
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		1	0	0	9	13	9		924/1554			4.10	4.01	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	920/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	1210/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	871/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	1	4	2	11	4.11	1065/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	4	1	3	0	2	6	3.75	889/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	1	6	9	9		1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	3	7	7	10		1149/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	8	5	6	6	7		1218/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.97
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	768/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	1	0	3	0	1		****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	1	1	1	1	1		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar	4.0	0	0	0	_	_	0	2 00	****/ OF	****	г оо	4 70	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	•	0	2	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00 ****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79			4.69	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.40		****
	41				-	-	_		,	****	****		4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45			4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.63	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.67	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.78	3.86	****
J. were there enough proctors for all the students	41	U	U	U	1	1	Τ	4.00	/ 362	3.00	3.44	4.00	3.00	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 44 Baltimore County

University of Maryland Spring 2009

Page 230 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 44 Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 231 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	13	12	13	3.64	1396/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	15	10	7	3.14	1509/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	6	9	9	15	3	3.00	1294/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	10	10	11	2	2.97	1472/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	5	10	6	10	3.68	1159/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	5	2	5	9			1372/1434	3.00		4.14	3.94	3.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	5	8	14	10		1316/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	5	9	23		1103/1574	4.50		4.64	4.59	4.49
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	8	12			876/1554			4.10	4.01	
• 5														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	920/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	1210/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	871/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	1	4	2	11	4.11	1065/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	4	1	3	0	2	6	3.75	889/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	1	6	9	9	3.38	1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	3	7	7	10	3.44	1149/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	8	5	6	6	7	2.97	1218/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.97
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	768/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar		_	_											
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
mini di mania														
Field Work	41	0	1	1	1	0	0	0 00	**** LO	****	****	4 40	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 48			4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Calf Darad														
Self Paced	41	0	1	0	1	0	1	2 00	****/ 40	++++	****	1 60	1 1 1	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	1	0	1		, 10	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24			4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28		****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	^ ^ * *

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)

Enrollment:

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 231 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

68 Questionnaires: 44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 47

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 232 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 47

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Spring 2009

Page 232 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 47

Title

68

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B) Spring 2009

Page 233 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions		NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	12	14	11	6	3.06	1532/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	15	10	10	3		1561/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	11	10	17	4	4		1335/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	8	3	10	7	2		1501/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	7	10	10	5	3.08	1372/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	15	8	7	6	6	1	2.46	1419/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	12	7	15	4	3.02	1457/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	1202/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	4	11	17	2	3.50	1303/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	5	5	14		1087/1488		4.24	4.47	4.41	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	2	1	6	18		1225/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	4	6	8	8		1249/1486		4.04	4.32	4.26	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	2	9	6	6		1319/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32		3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	5	1	3	3	7	4	3.56	997/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.39
Discussion	_	•							1040/1070					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	12	10	11		1043/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	4	10	7	16		1095/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	8 8	9	5 1	6 5	10 3	8 8	10 13		1172/1269 557/ 878	3.28	3.73 3.88	4.35 4.05	4.09 3.91	3.31
4. Were special techniques successiui	0	9	1	5	3	0	13	3.90	337/ 070	3.76	3.00	4.05	3.91	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	1	1	2	5	1		****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	1	1	6		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37 34	0	0	2 1	1	1 1	6 7		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	3	U	1	Τ	1	/	4.40	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	
Seminar	4.4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0 68	****		F 00	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0 2	0	1	2 1	0	0		****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	5.00 ****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79 ****/ 72	****	5.00	4.69 4.64	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44 44	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.64	4.43 4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
• •	11	1	U			U	U	2.50	/ 3/3	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	1	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	2	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	2	0	1	1	0	0			****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	2	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 233 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 47

WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 234 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies In		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	12	14	11	6	3.06	1532/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	15	10	10	3	2.64	1561/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	11	10	17	4	4	2.57	1335/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	8	3	10	7	2	2.73	1501/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	7	10	10	5	3.08	1372/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	15	8	7	6	6	1	2.46	1419/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	12	7	15	4	3.02	1457/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	1202/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	4	18	12	4.17	794/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	995/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	1041/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	806/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	976/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32		3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	9	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	916/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	12	10	11	3 55	1043/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	4	10	7	16		1095/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	10	8	10		1172/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	5	3	8	13	3.90	557/ 878		3.88	4.05	3.91	
1. Wele special econniques successful	U		_	3	3	O	13	3.70	3377 070	3.70	3.00	1.05	3.71	3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	****/ 234	***	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	****/ 240	***	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	***	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	2	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Colf Parad														
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.07	****/ 28	****	****	4.67	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	1	0	1	2	0		****/ 382		3.24	4.78	3.86	****
J. WELE CHELE ENOUGH PLOCEOUS TOE ALL CHE SCUGENES	72	Т	Τ	U	т	۷	U	3.00	/ 302	3.00	3.44	4.UO	3.00	•• ••

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 47

68

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

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

Page 234

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 47

MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 235 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Frequencies In		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	12	14	11	6	3.06	1532/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	15	10	10	3	2.64	1561/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	11	10	17	4	4	2.57	1335/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	8	3	10	7	2	2.73	1501/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	7	10	10	5	3.08	1372/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	15	8	7	6	6	1	2.46	1419/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	12	7	15	4	3.02	1457/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	2	3	12	23	4.40	1202/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	3	5	20	6	3.85	1096/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.46
T a shoot														
Lecture	٥٦	0	0	0	1	_	10	1 26	1005/1400	1 12	1 01	4 47	1 11	1 10
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	4	6	12		1025/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	-	4 7	18		1125/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	0	4	, 8	12 9	4.21	996/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	-	0	1	4	_	-		1042/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	9	U	3	3	4	4	3.64	953/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	12	10	11	3.55	1043/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	4	10	7	16	3.66	1095/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	10	8	10	3.31	1172/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	5	3	8	13	3.90	557/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	1	1	2	5	1		****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	1	1	1	6		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	2	1	1	6		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	1	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	2	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	1	0	1	2	0		****/ 382		3.24	4.08	3.86	****
J. Here effect changin procedure for all the scadelles	12	_		U		_	U	5.00	/ 302	5.00	J.4T	1.00	5.00	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 235 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 46

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 236

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	emie	ncie	e e		Instructo	CO1:	rse Dep	- IIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Ra		an Mea		Mean	Mean

General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	3	13	16	5	3.42 1474/	L576 3.	50 3.9	4.30	4.11	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	6	9	10	12	4	2.98 1529/	L576 3.	03 3.9	2 4.27	4.18	2.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	8	10	9	8	4	2.74 1324/	L342 2.	96 3.8	5 4.32	4.19	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	3	9	4	8	3	2.96 1475/	L520 3.	12 3.8	4.25	4.09	2.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	6	6	11	11	3.64 1187/	L465 3.	54 3.9	4.12	4.02	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	2	4	5	5	2	3.06 1370/	L434 3.	00 3.7	5 4.14	3.94	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	5	8	13	10	4	3.00 1459/	L547 3.	27 3.8	7 4.19	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	2	8	30	4.70 866/		50 4.7		4.59	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	9	7	10	7	0	2.45 1528/		56 3.8			3.66
Lecture													
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	6	0	4	2	9	11	14	3.72 1359/		13 4.2		4.41	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	5	4	4	15	12	3.63 1465/	L493 4.	36 4.4	3 4.73	4.65	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	7	14	6	8	5	2.75 1455/		71 4.0	4.32	4.26	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	17	5	4	7	6	2.49 1467/	L489 3.	63 3.9	7 4.32	4.22	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	13	6	4	8	2	2.39 1248/	L277 3.	37 3.7	2 4.03	3.91	3.38
Diamondo													
Discussion	1 2	0	_	2	1	0	10	2 61 1000 /	1070 2	FF 2 0	1 1 7	2 06	2 (1
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	4	9	12	3.61 1022/		55 3.8		3.96	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	3	4	7	13	3.71 1075/		65 3.9		4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	7	11	4	3.13 1203/				4.09	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	2	2	5	7	10	3.81 603/	878 3.	76 3.8	3 4.05	3.91	3.81
Laboratory													
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00 ****/	224 **	** 4.2	2 4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50 ****/		** 4.3		4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50 ****/		** 4.4		4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00 ****/		** 4.1		4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/				4.27	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	45	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00 ^^^/	3/9 4.	17 4.2	4.20	4.15	
Seminar													
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	85 **	** 5.0	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	79 **	** ***	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	72 **	** 5.0	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	80 **	** ***	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	375 3.	00 3.1	2 4.01	3.78	****
Field Work													
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	J 2	** ***	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	10	** ***	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	11	** ***	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	45 **	** ***	4.57	4.72	****
Self Paced													
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	40 **	** ***	* 4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	24 **		4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/		** ***		4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/		** ***	1.07	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/		00 3.2		3.86	****
J. Here there enough proceeds for all the students	±0	U	U	U	т.	U	U	3.00/	JUZ 3.	00 3.2	1 7.00	٥٠.٥٥	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 46

66

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 236 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment:

Title

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

66 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 237 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

_			
Ctudant	Course	Fraluation	Questionnaire
beadene	COULSE	Evaluation	Quescronnarre

	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	3	13	16	5	3.42	1474/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	6	9	10	12	4	2.98	1529/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	8	10	9	8	4	2.74	1324/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	3	9	4	8	3	2.96	1475/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	6	6	11	11	3.64	1187/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	2	4	5	5			1370/1434	3.00		4.14	3.94	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	5	8	13	10	4		1459/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	866/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		1	0	1	13	11			1299/1554				4.01	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10		U	_	13		2	3.32	12/0/1004	3.30	3.00	4.10	7.01	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	2	2	7	12	4 26	1103/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	1	2	7	13		1291/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	3	1	4	7			1313/1486	3.71	4.04		4.26	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	2	2	10	4		1262/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	3	2	1	4	5	7		902/1277				3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	3	2	1	4	5	/	3.74	902/12//	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	4	9	12	3 61	1022/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	3	4	7	13		1075/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	7	11	4		1203/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.13
-	15	5	2	2	5	7			603/878					
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	4	2	5	/	10	3.81	003/ 8/8	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4 00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
_		0	0	0	0	1	1			****			4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44				0				****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35		****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	-	1	1		****/ 229		4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
			-	0	0	1	-		,	****	****			****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0				0	4.00		****		4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80		****	4.61	4.55	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Dield Week														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1 □	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4 20	****
	45		0	0	0	1	0		,	****	****		4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	-	-	-	_	•		,	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	/ 11			4.73	4.71	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
Cole Dorod														
Self Paced	4 -	^	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ ^^	****	****	1 60	1 11	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	-	0	1	•		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24			4.83	4.71	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	* * * *
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 46

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

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

Page 237

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 238 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	3	13	16	5	3.42	1474/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	6	9	10	12	4	2.98	1529/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	2.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	8	10	9	8	4	2.74	1324/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	3	9	4	8	3	2.96	1475/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	6	6	11	11	3.64	1187/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1370/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	5	8	13	10	4		1459/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	866/1574		4.76	4.64		4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	0	1	17	7		732/1554		3.80	4.10	4.01	
y, non mourd for grade one everall economic effectiveness		_	ŭ	Ü	_		•		,32,2331	3.30	3.00	1.10	1.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	1087/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	1	9	6		1331/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	1	2	7	6		1054/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	888/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32		3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	3	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	928/1277				3.91	
5. Did additivibual eccliniques chilanee your anderstanding	30	5	O	2	3	J	,	3.05	J20/12//	3.37	3.72	1.05	3.71	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	4	9	12	3.61	1022/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	3	4	7	13		1075/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	7	11	4		1203/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35		3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	2	2	5	7	10	3.81			3.88	4.05	3.91	
1. Weie special techniques successiul	13	5	2		J	,	10	3.01	003/ 0/0	3.70	3.00	1.05	3.71	3.01
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
3. Were requirements for tab reports ereally specified	13	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	0	Ü	3.00	, 3,3	1.17	1.21	1.20	1.13	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01		****
5. Hold dilbolia for grading made ordar		Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	Ū	ŭ	3.00	, 3.3	3.00	3.11	1.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
1. 10 what degree court you discuss your evaluations	13	U	J	U	_	U	J	3.00	, 43			1.57	1./2	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
5. Here there chagn proceeds for all the betweeness	10	J	J	J	_	J	J	3.00	, 302	3.00	5.21	1.00	3.00	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 46

Baltimore County DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

66

Spring 2009

Page 238 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 46

66

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 239 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	3	13	16	5		1474/1576		3.94	4.30	4.11	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	6	9	10	12	4		1529/1576		3.92	4.27	4.18	2.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	8	10	9	8	4		1324/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	13	3	9	4	8	3		1475/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	2.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	6	6	11	11		1187/1465		3.90	4.12	4.02	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	2	4	5	5	2		1370/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	5	8	13	10	4		1459/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	2	8	30	4.70			4.76	4.64	4.59	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	0	0	0	14	10	4.42	518/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	970/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	1331/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	1010/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	888/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	3	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	916/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1 2	0	5	3	4	9	1 2	2 61	1022/1279	2 55	2 00	4.17	3.96	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13 15	0	4	3	4	9 7	12 13		1075/1279	3.55 3.65	3.80 3.91	4.17	4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	7	11	4		1203/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	2	2	5	7	10		603/ 878		3.88	4.05		3.13
1. Were special techniques successful	13	J	2	2	J	,	10	3.01	003/ 070	3.70	3.00	4.05	3.71	3.01
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	***	^ ^ ^ ^	4.57	4.72	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 239 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

101 0104 University of Maryland
OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Instructor: SZAI
Enrollment: 53

53

Ouestionnaires: 28

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 240

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 28

Title

I, VERONIK (Instr. A) Spring

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 240 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

Baltimore County HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B) Spring 2009

Page 241 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 53 Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	5	11		1345/1576		3.94	4.30	4.11	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	10	3	7		1501/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	6	5	4	9		1263/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	4	3	10	5		1330/1520		3.84	4.25	4.09	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	4	6	6		1295/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	2	5	3	2		1366/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	8	9		1294/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	1	2	4	16		1063/1574		4.76	4.64	4.59	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	5	10	2	3.63	1247/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	846/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	2	16		1017/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22			4.04	4.32	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	5	8		1118/1489		3.97	4.32		3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	2	0	0	3	11	4.31		3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.76
Discussion		•	_	_	_				4445/4050					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	7	2	9		1115/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	2	5	2	10		1153/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	2	7	1	9		1145/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	440/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 240	***	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 229	***	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	186/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.17
Quantum and														
Seminar	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 85	****	г оо	4 70	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26 26	0	1 1	0	1 1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	5.00 ****	4.72 4.69	4.52 4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.69	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	3.00
or note offeria for grading made offer		Ü	Ü	Ü		Ü	Ü	3.00	201, 313	3.00	3.12	1.01	3.70	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	313/ 382		3.24	4.08	3.86	3.00
1 Shore shough proceed for all the beautiful		J	J	0	_0	J	J	2.00	515, 552	5.00	5.21	1.00	2.00	2.00

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 53 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 241 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment:

MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. C)

53

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 242 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 28 Student Cou	ırse	Eval	uati	on Q	uest	ionn	aire	2						
					ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	5	11	3.75	1345/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	10	3	7		1501/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	6	5	4	9		1263/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	4	3	10	5	3.61	1330/1520	3.12	3.84		4.09	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	4	6	6	3.39	1295/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	2	2	5	3	2	3.07	1366/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	8	9	3.63	1294/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	1063/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	871/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	638/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1113/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	607/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	888/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	347/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	7	2	9		1115/1279		3.80	4.17	3.96	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	2	5	2	10		1153/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	2	7	1	9		1145/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	440/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80		****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	4		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	186/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00		****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.78	3.00
Field Work		•	_	_	_	•	_	0.00		4.4	4.4.1.1	4 45	4 00	4.4.1
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	, -	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27 19	0	0	0	1 9	0	0	3.00	****/ 45 251/ 326	****	**** 3.45	4.57	4.72 3.64	****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	***	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
	1.0	_	•	_	1.	_	_	2 00	212/200	2 00	2 04	4 00	2 06	2 00

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students $12 \ 0 \ 0 \ 16 \ 0 \ 0 \ 3.00 \ 313/ \ 382 \ 3.00 \ 3.24 \ 4.08 \ 3.86 \ 3.00$

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 28

CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County SAMUEL (Instr. C) Spring 2009

53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Frequency Distribution

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

Page 242

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A) Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 48

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 243 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 4 0 1 3 16 13 11 3.68 1374/1576 3.50 3.94 4.30 4.11 3.68 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4 0 4 7 14 12 7 3.25 1484/1576 3.03 3.92 4.27 4.18 3.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 6 4 12 13 8 3.30 1259/1342 2.96 3.86 4.32 4.19 3.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 14 0 6 9 7 6 3.46 1377/1520 3.12 3.84 4.25 4.09 3.46 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7 6 1 5 4 12 13 3.89 1004/1465 3.54 3.90 4.12 4.02 3.89 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 19 3 1 8 5 5 3.36 1278/1434 3.00 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.36 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 7 0 6 5 14 6 10 3.22 1420/1547 3.27 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.22 7 2 0 0 4 15 20 4.41 1189/1574 4.50 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.41 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18 0 4 5 13 4 4 2.97 1462/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 2 5 12 11 14 3.68 1365/1488 4.13 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.03 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 2 4 5 12 20 4.02 1409/1493 4.36 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.41 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 7 10 10 9 8 3.02 1419/1486 3.71 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.53 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 4 10 5 9 6 9 2.97 1422/1489 3.63 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.53 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 7 5 10 8 4 7 2.94 1176/1277 3.37 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.06 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 4 2 6 8 15 3.80 938/1279 3.55 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 2 7 4 19 3.97 951/1270 3.65 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.97 3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 3 2 11 6 12 3.65 1073/1269 3.28 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.65 4. Were special techniques successful 15 5 4 1 5 5 13 3.79 614/878 3.76 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.79 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 46 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 47 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 47 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 232 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 46 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 4.17 4.24 4.20 4.15 **** Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 47 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 375 3.00 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Credits Earned 00-27 14 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 10
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 9 General 0
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 3 D 0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 General 0 Under-grad 48 Non-major 48 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2.8 ? 2

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B) Instructor:

Enrollment: 72 Ouestionnaires: 48

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 244 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 4 0 1 3 16 13 11 3.68 1374/1576 3.50 3.94 4.30 4.11 3.68 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4 0 4 7 14 12 7 3.25 1484/1576 3.03 3.92 4.27 4.18 3.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 6 4 12 13 8 3.30 1259/1342 2.96 3.86 4.32 4.19 3.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 14 0 6 9 7 6 3.46 1377/1520 3.12 3.84 4.25 4.09 3.46 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7 6 1 5 4 12 13 3.89 1004/1465 3.54 3.90 4.12 4.02 3.89 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 19 3 1 8 5 5 3.36 1278/1434 3.00 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.36 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 7 0 6 5 14 6 10 3.22 1420/1547 3.27 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.22 7 2 0 0 4 15 20 4.41 1189/1574 4.50 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.41 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 0 0 0 18 6 3 3.44 1331/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 25 0 1 1 5 6 10 4.00 1233/1488 4.13 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.03 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 23 0 1 2 3 5 14 4.16 1384/1493 4.36 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.41 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 29 0 2 2 7 3 5 3.37 1369/1486 3.71 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.53 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 28 2 2 4 3 4 5 3.33 1363/1489 3.63 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.53 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 29 3 3 1 6 2 4 3.19 1123/1277 3.37 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.06 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 4 2 6 8 15 3.80 938/1279 3.55 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 2 7 4 19 3.97 951/1270 3.65 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.97 3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 3 2 11 6 12 3.65 1073/1269 3.28 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.65 4. Were special techniques successful 15 5 4 1 5 5 13 3.79 614/878 3.76 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.79 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 46 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 47 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 47 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 232 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 46 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 4.17 4.24 4.20 4.15 **** Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 47 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 3.00 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Credits Earned 00-27 14 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 4 C 9 General 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 General 0 Under-grad 48 Non-major 48 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 2.8 ? 2

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 245

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 72

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 48 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1 Did von gain r	General new insights,skills from this cou	irce	4	0	1	3	16	13	11	3 68	1374/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.68
	actor make clear the expected goa		4	0	4	7	14	12	7		1484/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.25
	questions reflect the expected go		5	0	6	4	12	13	8		1259/1342	2.96	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.30
	uations reflect the expected goa		6	14	0	6	9	7	6		1377/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.46
	readings contribute to what you l		7	6	1	5	4	12	13		1004/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.89
	signments contribute to what you		7	19	3	1	8	5	5		1278/1434	3.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.36
	ng system clearly explained	. IouInou	7	0	6	5	14	6	10		1420/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.22
_	s was class cancelled		7	2	0	0	4	15	20		1189/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.41
-	grade the overall teaching effect	ctiveness	21	1	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	395/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.67
	Lecture															
1 Were the instr	ructor's lectures well prepared		32	0	1	0	2	4	9	4 25	1111/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.03
	actor seem interested in the subj	iect	29	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	849/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.41
	sterial presented and explained of	•	33	0	0	0	5	2	8		1003/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.53
	res contribute to what you learne	_	31	2	0	1	2	6	6		1042/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.53
	al techniques enhance your unders		33	5	0	2	5	0	3		****/1277	3.37		4.03	3.91	
	-															
1 54 -1 44	Discussion		1.0	^	4	_	_	8	1 -	2 00	020/1070	2 55	2 00	4 1 7	2 06	2 00
	cussions contribute to what you l ents actively encouraged to parti		13	0	4	2	6 7	4	15 19	3.80 3.97	938/1279 951/1270	3.55 3.65	3.80 3.91	4.17	3.96 4.09	3.80
	ents actively encouraged to parti- actor encourage fair and open dis		13 14	0	3	2	11	6	19		1073/1269	3.05	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.65
	ector encourage rair and open dis echniques successful	SCUSSION	15	5	4	1	5	5	13	3.79	614/ 878	3.26	3.88	4.05	3.91	
	-										, ,					
1 - 1 1 1 1 1 1	Laboratory		4.5	•	0	-	0	-	•	2 00	**** (024	ale ale ale ale	4 00	4 00	4 00	****
	crease understanding of the mate		46	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
	ded with adequate background inf		47	0	0	0	0	0	0 1		****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
-	r materials available for lab act sstructor provide assistance	lvities	47 47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229 ****/ 232	****	4.49 4.14	4.51	4.43	****
	ents for lab reports clearly spec	rified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	4.17	4.14	4.29	4.15	****
o. were requireme	ents for lab reports clearly spec	zilied	40	1	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 3/9	4.1/	4.24	4.20	4.13	
E Novo gritorio	Seminar for grading made clear		47	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 375	2 00	2 10	4 01	2 70	***
5. Were Criteria	for grading made crear		47	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 3/3	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.70	
		Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expecte	ed Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27 14	0.00-0.99 0 A	8		Red	quir	 ed f	or M	 lajor	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 2	1.00-1.99 0 B	10			-			-						J -		
56-83 1	2.00-2.99 4 C	9		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 4	8	Non-	major	48
84-150 1	3.00-3.49 3 D	0											_			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 7 F	0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
	Р	0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I	0		Oth	ner				2	18						
	?	2														

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 246

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 48 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							FΥ	emie	ncie	g		Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sec
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
l Did	ou coin n	General ew insights,skil	_	m this source	4	0	1	3	16	13	11	2 60	1374/1576	3.50	3.94	4.30	1 11	3.6
		ctor make clear			4	0	4	7	14	12	7		1484/1576	3.03	3.92	4.27		3.2
		uestions reflect			5	0	6	4	12	13	8		1259/1342		3.86	4.32		3.3
		uations reflect			6	14	0	6	9	7	6		1377/1520	3.12	3.84	4.25		3.4
				what you learned	7	6	1	5	4	12	13		1004/1465	3.54	3.90	4.12		3.8
	_	-		what you learned	7	19	3	1	8	5	5		1278/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.3
		g system clearly			7	0	6	5	14	6	10	3.22	1420/1547	3.27	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.2
		was class cance			7	2	0	0	4	15	20	4.41	1189/1574	4.50	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.4
				ning effectiveness	21	1	0	1	10	9	6	3.77	1159/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.6
		Lecture	е															
. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture:	s well p	prepared	33	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	1155/1488	4.13	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.0
. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	29	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	1029/1493	4.36	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.4
				xplained clearly	33	0	1	1	7	1	5	3.53	1323/1486	3.71	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.
		es contribute to			31	2	0	4	2	4	5	3.67	1283/1489	3.63	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.
. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	33	5	1	1	5	0	3	3.30	****/1277	3.37	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	13	0	4	2	6	8	15	3.80	938/1279	3.55	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.
				d to participate	13	0	3	2	7	4	19	3.97	951/1270	3.65	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.
				d open discussion	14	0	3	2	11	6	12		1073/1269	3.28	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.
. Were s	special to	echniques succes	ssful		15	5	4	1	5	5	13	3.79	614/ 878	3.76	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.
		Labora	_															
		crease understa			46	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 234		4.22	4.23		***
				ground information	47	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35		**:
	_			or lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51		**:
		structor provide			47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		4.14	4.29	4.11 4.18 4.19 4.09 4.02 3.94 4.10 4.59 4.01 4.41 4.65 4.22 3.91 3.96 4.09 4.09 3.91 4.08 4.27 4.15 3.78 Majors	**:
. Were r	requireme	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.15	**:
Works	aritoria	Semina: for grading made			47	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 375	2 00	2 12	4 01	2 70	**:
. Wele C	JIICEIIA .	ior grading made	e Cieai			-	_		-	U	1	3.00	/ 3/3	3.00	3.12	4.01	3.70	
				Frequ	lency	7 Dis	trib	utic	n									
redits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	 Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 10														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 9		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 4	8	Non-	-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0											_		4.11 4.18 4.19 4.09 4.02 3.94 4.10 4.59 4.01 4.41 4.65 4.26 4.22 3.91 3.96 4.09 4.09 3.91 4.08 4.29 4.15 3.78 Majors	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	gh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot!	her				2	28					4.18 4.19 4.09 4.02 3.94 4.10 4.59 4.01 4.41 4.65 4.26 4.22 3.91 3.96 4.09 3.91 4.08 4.29 4.43 4.27 4.15 3.78	
				? 2														

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) Enrollment:

60 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 247 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	13	9	3.70	1370/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	9	12	10	3.85	1270/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	5	13	10	3.97	1010/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1271/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	8	7	10	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	7	5	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	999/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	720/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	5	9	6	1	3.05	1441/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	5	5	8	6	7	3.16	1438/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	4	3	23		1263/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	8	5	7		1416/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	5	5	5	7	6		1402/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	3	3	4	7	9	3.62	968/1277		3.72	4.03		3.97
Diamondon														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	957/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	908/1279	3.88	3.91	4.17	4.09	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	5	4	14	4.12	894/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	4	3		3.90	557/ 878		3.73		3.91	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	J	5	2	_	7	3	10	3.90	3377 878	3.04	3.00	4.05	3.91	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help jou carry out rield decivious	33	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	-	Ü	1.00	, 320	1.55	3.13	1.05	3.01	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 34

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 247 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

rollment: 60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 60

60

Questionnaires: 34

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 248 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Questions N		NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	13	9	3.70	1370/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	9	12	10		1270/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	5	13	10	3.97	1010/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1271/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	8	7	10	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	7	5	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	999/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	1	0	4	26		720/1574		4.76			4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	2	11	5	3	3.43	1340/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	2	4	17	4.31	1072/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	2	2	7	15	4.22	1366/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	3	4	6	10		1207/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	2	1	8	4	6		1310/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	3	1	3	6	10	3.83	845/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	957/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	908/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	5	4	14	4.12	894/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	4	3	10	3.90	557/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	2	2		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 72 ****/ 80	****	5.00 ****	4.64	4.43	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	33 33	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	1.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.61 4.01	4.55 3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	33	U	U	U	U		U	4.00	/ 3/5		3.12	4.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35 ****/ 28	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
<ol> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> <li>Were there enough proctors for all the students</li> </ol>	33 33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28 ****/ 382	****		4.78	4.65 3.86	****
5. were there enough proctors for all the students	33	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 382		3.24	4.08	3.80	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 248 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor:

Enrollment:

DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

60 Questionnaires: 34

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 249 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	13	9	3.70	1370/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.70
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	9	12	10	3.85	1270/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.85
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	5	13	10	3.97	1010/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.97
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1271/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.73
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	8	7	10	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	7	5	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13
	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	999/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06
	How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	720/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.77
	-	11	1	0	1	7	9	5	3.82	1124/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53
										,					
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	846/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	0	5	4	11		1390/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.24
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	944/1486	3.92		4.32	4.26	3.84
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	2	4	3	6		1278/1489	3.81	3.97		4.22	3.56
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	4	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	593/1277		3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97
٠.	pra address and seeming of the andersoanding		-	Ü	_		-	Ü	1.17	333,12	5.05	3.72	1.05	3.71	3.7
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	957/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.76
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	908/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.09
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	5	4	14	4.12	894/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.12
	Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	4	3	10	3.90	557/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	
	Word Special Committees Successful		J	_	_	-			3.50	3377 373	3.01	3.00	1.00	3.71	3.70
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	4		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	2	2		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
٠.	were requirements for raw reports creating specified		_	Ü	Ū	Ū	-		1.75	, 3.3			1.20	1.15	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
٠.	ware ordered for grading made order	55	Ü	Ü	Ū	Ü	_	ŭ	1.00	, 3.3		3.12	1.01	3.70	
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 326	4.33	3.45		3.64	****
٦.	Dia conferences neip you early out field activities	55	U	U	U	U	_	J	1.00	, 320	1.55	5.15	1.03	3.01	
	Self Paced														
1	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
٦.	"ere energy proceeds for all the students	ر ر	U	J	J	J	_	U	1.00	/ 302		J. 4T	1.00	5.00	

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 34

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 249 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 34

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 250 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	13	9		1370/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	9	12	10	3.85	1270/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	5	13	10	3.97	1010/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1271/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	8	7	10	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	7	5	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	999/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	720/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	7	9	5	3.82	1124/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	15	0	1	0	1	3				4.07	4.24	4.47		4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	0	5	4	11		1390/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	1	2	5	10		1032/1486	3.92	4.04		4.26	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	1	3	5	6		1205/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	4	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	533/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97
Discussion	0	0	2	1	_	_	1.0	2 76	057/1070	2 56	2 00	4 1 7	2 06	2 76
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	957/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	908/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	5	4	14	4.12	894/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	4	3	10	3.90	557/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.90
Laboratory														
Laboratory	20	0	0	1	2	2	1	2 50	****/ 234	****	4 00	4.23	4.08	****
<ol> <li>Did the lab increase understanding of the material</li> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> </ol>	28 28	0	0	1	0	2	3			***	4.22 4.38		4.08	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28 28	1	0	0	0	1	3 4	4.17	****/ 229	****		4.35 4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	1	0	0	2	2		****/ 232	****	4.49		4.43	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 379	****	$4.14 \\ 4.24$	4.29 4.20		***
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	20	۷	U	U	U	Т	3	4.75	/ 3/9		4.24	4.20	4.15	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
The second secon									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 34 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 250 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 251 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	6	11	21	11	3.60	1413/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	20	20	8	3.50	1392/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	4	14	17	17		1114/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	9	11	13	5	3.37	1410/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	1	1	8	19	12	3.98	891/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	9	11	5	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	2	1	7	26	15	4.00	1041/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	2	12	37	4.62	987/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	3	6	21	10	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	6	8	18	14	4		1450/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47		3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	3	6	9	32		1286/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	5	8	14	16	6		1392/1486	3.92			4.26	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	8	16	12	8		1392/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	7	4	6	11	12	7	3.30	1095/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.58
Discussion	22	0	2	5	0	1 /	7	2 52	1055/1070	2 56	2 00	1 17	2 06	2 [2
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22 22	0	2 2	5 5	8 8	14 9	7 12		1055/1279	3.56	3.80 3.91	4.17	3.96	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	4		9	14	6		1091/1270	3.88		4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22 22	3	1	3	9				1139/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	Т	3	9	8	12	3.82	598/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.82
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4 33	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	4	2		, -	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	3	1			****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	1	4	2		****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20		****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	, -	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00		****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	,	****	****	4.73	4.71	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
ant David														
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	2	0	2 67	****/ 40	****	****	1 60	1 11	****
	55 55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.67	,	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55 55	0	1	0	1	1	0		,	****	****	4.83 4.67	4.71 4.68	****
<ol> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> </ol>	55 55	0	U T	0	2	1	0	3.33	,	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 382	****	3.24		3.86	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	U	U	U	۷	Т	U	3.33	/ 302		3.44	4.00	3.00	

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 58

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 251 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 58

# Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 252 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions N				_	ncie		_		ructor	Course				Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	6	11	21	11	3.60	1413/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	20	20	8	3.50	1392/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	4	14	17	17	3.80	1114/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	9	11	13	5	3.37	1410/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	1	1	8	19	12	3.98	891/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	9	11	5		1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	2	1	7	26	15		1041/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	2	12	37	4.62	987/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	4	5	14	15	2	3.15	1418/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	1	10	9	15		1233/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	2	3	11	22		1291/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	1	10	12	13		1158/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	1	9	13	10		1266/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32		3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	5	3	2	8	8	TT	3.69	933/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	5	8	14	7		1055/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	5	8	9	12		1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	3	9	14	6		1139/1269		3.73	4.35		3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	3	9	8	12	3.82	598/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.82
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	3	1		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.07	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	J . J .	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 58

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## Frequency Distribution

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 252

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72

Questionnaires: 58

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 253 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	3	6	11	21	11	3.60	1413/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	20	20	8		1392/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	4	14	17	17		1114/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	9	11	13	5		1410/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	1	1	8	19	12	3.98	891/1465		3.90	4.12	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	2	9	11	5		1245/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	2	1	7	26	15		1041/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	2	12	37	4.62	987/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	0	4	12	22	4.47	436/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50
Tashiina														
Lecture	2.1	0	0	0	1	9	1 /	4 27	1010/1400	4 07	1 01	4 47	1 11	2 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	0 1	4	8	14 22		1018/1488	4.07		4.47	4.41	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23		0	0	4	8	19	4.46	1248/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73 4.32	4.65	4.33 3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28 30	0	1	3	3	9	12		642/1486 1118/1489	3.92 3.81	4.04 3.97	4.32	4.26 4.22	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	8	1	2	4	5	7	3.79	869/1277		3.72	4.32	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	0	1	4	4	5	/	3.19	009/12//	3.03	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	5	8	14	7	3.53	1055/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	5	8	9	12		1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	3	9	14			1139/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	3	9	8			598/ 878			4.05	3.91	
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	2	0	1	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	U	U	U	2	1	4.33	****/ 375	***	3.12	4.01	3.78	***
Field Work														
		0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4 20	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55 55	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.20	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.40	4.11 4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	0	0	0	2	1	1		****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	***
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid accivities	94	U	U	U	4	т	Т	3.15	/ 320	4.33	3.43	4.03	3.04	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
		-	-	-	_	_	-		, 502					

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 58

72

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 253 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 58

MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)

University of Maryland Spring 2009

Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 254

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 58 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 254 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor:

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 255 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 57

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 22

6

D

F

2

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					_	encie		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Se
	Questions 	NR	NA	1 	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Me
	General														
Did you gair	n new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	11	21	16	3.71	1361/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.
Did the inst	tructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	8	17	17	11	3.45	1419/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3
	m questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	13	16	13	3.41	1245/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3
Did other e	valuations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	3	10	14	3	3.26	1435/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3
	d readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	2	14	10	20	3.92	975/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3
	assignments contribute to what you learned	l 1	32	4	4	3	8	5	3.25	1313/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3
	ding system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	14	17	19	3.84	1196/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3
_	mes was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	47	4.84			4.76	4.64	4.59	4
	ou grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	7	8	18	11	2	2.85	1494/1554		3.80	4.10	4.01	3
	T a shows														
Wara tha in	Lecture structor's lectures well prepared	2	0	11	9	11	16	8	2 02	1451/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4
	tructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	3	5	7	37		1355/1493		4.43	4.73	4.65	4
		4	0	13	7	15	8	10		1444/1486	3.92	4.04	4.73	4.26	4
	material presented and explained clearly tures contribute to what you learned	3	1	11	8	10	12	12		1444/1489		3.97	4.32	4.20	4
		3	8	7	6	7	9								
Did audiovis	sual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	/	О	/	9	17	3.50	1020/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4
	Discussion														
Did class d	iscussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	20	11	3.63	1014/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3
Were all st	udents actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	13	18	3.84	1022/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3
Did the inst	tructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	3	9	13	13	3.55	1104/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3
Were special	13	5	3	4	8	9	15	3.74	637/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3	
	Laboratory														
Did the lab	increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	*
	ovided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	*
	ary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	*
	instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	*
	ements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	*
	Garaka an														
Were assign	Seminar ed topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	*
_	tructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	*
	h projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	*
	ations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	*
_	ia for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 375	***	3.12	4.01	3.78	*
	0.15 70 3														
Did golf. so	Self Paced ced system contribute to what you learned	5.6	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	1 11	*
_		56	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 24	****	****		4.44	*
	uestions make clear the expected goal	56						0			****		4.83	4.71	*
	dback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 28		****	4.78	4.65	*
were there	enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	*
	uency	y Di	strik	outio	on										
edits Earned	;			Re	eason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	5	
 )-27 8	0.00-0.99 0 A 17		 .a	 equir			la ior		2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		
3-55 15	1.00-1.99 0 B 11		IX.	cdarr	.cu l	.OI N	10 ر ما	. 0	4	Graduat	_	U	ria JC	) <u>+</u>	
5-83 6	2.00-2.99 1 C 9		C	enera	. 7				0	Under-g	rad 5	7	Non-	-major	
1 1 5 0 1	2.00-2.99 1 C 9		50	CITCTO					J	onder-9	rau 5	,	11011-	ila Jot	

Electives

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

I 0 Other 38

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment:

0

3.50-4.00

22

Grad.

68 Questionnaires: 57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 256 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	11	21	16	3.71	1361/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	8	17	17	11		1419/1576		3.92	4.27	4.18	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	13	16	13		1245/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	3	10	14	3		1435/1520		3.84	4.25	4.09	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	2	14	10	20		975/1465		3.90		4.02	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	4	4	3	8	5		1313/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	14	17	19		1196/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	47		606/1574		4.76	4.64		4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	6	2	22	8	2		1466/1554		3.80	4.10	4.01	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	1	5	9	21	4.21	1142/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	0	5	7	27	4.47	1232/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	2	3	7	9	17	3.95	1158/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	3	0	8	10	16	3.97	1140/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	4	3	5	9	11	3.63	963/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion		_	_	_		0								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	20	11		1014/1279		3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	13	18		1022/1270		3.91	4.35	4.09	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	3	9	13	13		1104/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	3	4	8	9	15	3.74	637/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.74
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	4.30	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232		4.14	4.29	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	ре			Majors	;
00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 17		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55 15 1.00-1.99 0 B 11		~		,				0	TT	5	7	37		E 4
56-83 6 2.00-2.99 1 C 9		Ger	nera.	T				0	Under-g	rad 5	7	Non-	-major	54
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 6 D 2								0			1			,

Electives

0

F

0

I 0 Other 38

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)

Enrollment:

68 Questionnaires: 57 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 257 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	11	21	16	2 71	1361/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	8	17	17	11		1419/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.11	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	13	16	13		1245/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	3	10	14	3		1435/1520		3.84	4.25	4.09	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	2	14	10	20	3.92	975/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	4	4	3	8	5		1313/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	14	17	19		1196/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	47	4.84			4.76	4.64	4.59	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	2	0	1	14	24	4.41	,		3.80	4.10	4.01	3.65
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	O	2	O	_		21	1.11	310/1331	3.30	3.00	1.10	1.01	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	0	4	26	4.74	526/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	658/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	1	3	25	4.70	422/1486	3.92		4.32	4.26	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	364/1489	3.81	3.97		4.22	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	5	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	385/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	20	11	3 63	1014/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	13	18		1022/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	3	9	13	13		1104/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	3	4	8	9	15		637/ 878		3.88	4.05	3.91	
1. NOTO SPOOTAT COMMINATOR SUCCESSIVAT	13	3	3	-	Ü		13	3.,1	0377 070	3.01	3.00	1.05	3.71	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	***	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	***	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	***	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP <i>I</i>	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	А	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	57	Non-major	54
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	

I 0 Other 38

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Instructor:

Enrollment:

MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

68

Questionnaires: 57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 258 JUL 2, 2009 Baltimore County Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	11	21	16	3.71	1361/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	8	17	17	11	3.45	1419/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	13	16	13	3.41	1245/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	4	3	10	14	3	3.26	1435/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	2	14	10	20	3.92	975/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	l 1	32	4	4	3	8	5	3.25	1313/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	14	17	19	3.84	1196/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	47	4.84	606/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	2	0	1	15	22	4.38	571/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	0	4	26	4.74	526/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	7	28	4.80	810/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	1	4	24	4.67	468/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	364/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	5	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	385/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	1	4	20	11	3.63	1014/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	13	18	3.84	1022/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	3	9	13	13	3.55	1104/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	3	4	8	9	15	3.74	637/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.74
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 379		4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	***	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
Freq	[uenc]	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	ne			Majors	ł.
	. – – – –													
00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 17 28-55 15 1.00-1.99 0 B 11		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`S	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
56-83 6 2.00-2.99 1 C 9		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 5	7	Non-	major	54
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 6 D 2								•						
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 22 F 0 P 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - respons				_	ın

I 0 Other 38

University of Maryland

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) Enrollment: 73

Questionnaires: 60

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 259

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 60

Spring 2009

Page 259 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38	_			
				?	1						

Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Instructor:

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 60

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

## Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 260

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2 4 18 22 13 3.68 1379/1576 3.68 3.94 4.30 4.11 3.68 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 2 8 28 12 8 3.28 1480/1576 3.58 3.92 4.27 4.18 3.28 3.29 14. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 19 1 5 12 10 9 3.57 1342/1520 3.54 3.84 4.25 4.09 3.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 13 3 7 8 13 12 3.56 1225/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.02 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 23 3 2 11 13 3 3.34 1285/1434 3.27 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.34 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 2 3 3 17 16 14 3.66 1276/1547 3.92 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.66 8. How many times was class cancelled 4 2 0 1 1 9 43 4.74 776/1574 4.72 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.74 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18 1 6 5 19 10 1 2.88 1489/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.62 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 29 0 2 4 3 6 16 3.97 1266/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 3.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 27 0 2 2 3 6 20 4.21 1370/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.27 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 33 0 4 2 8 4 9 3.44 1349/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.80 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 31 1 5 6 5 4 8 3.14 1402/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 29 5 4 3 8 6 5 3.19 1121/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 2.98 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.16 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 7 7 16 3.74 1062/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.74 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.55 4. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 5 14 3.49 715/ 878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.49 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 57 1 2 5.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 **** 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 Ω 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** / 229 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 58 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 58 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 232 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 59 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 58 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.61 4.55 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** Field Work 2 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 Ω 0 0 2 5.00 **** / 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 58 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.73 4.71 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 58 0 0 Self Paced 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 0 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.67 4.68 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.78 4.65 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 58 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 382 **** 3.24 4.08 3.86 **** Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 73 Questionnaires: 60 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 260 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: Enrollment:

GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)

73 Questionnaires: 60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 261 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 60

73

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 261 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38	-			
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 73

Questionnaires: 60

Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 262 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionn	LION QUESCIONNAILE
-------------------------------------	--------------------

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 2 8 28 12 8 3.28 1480/1576 3.58 3.92 4.27 4.18 23 10d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 3 4 7 11 22 9 3.47 1221/1342 3.66 3.86 4.32 4.19 5 4.05 10d other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 19 1 5 12 10 9 3.57 1342/1520 3.54 3.84 4.25 4.09 5 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 13 3 7 8 13 12 3.56 1225/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.02 5 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 23 3 2 11 13 3 3.34 1285/1434 3.27 3.75 4.14 3.94 5 7 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2 4 18 22 13 3.68 1379/1576 3.68 3.94 4.30 4.11 22 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 2 8 28 12 8 3.28 1480/1576 3.58 3.92 4.27 4.18 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 3 4 7 11 22 9 3.47 1221/1342 3.66 3.86 4.32 4.19 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 19 1 5 12 10 9 3.57 1342/1520 3.54 3.84 4.25 4.09 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 13 3 7 8 13 12 3.56 1225/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.02 5. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 5 2 3 3 17 16 14 3.66 1276/1547 3.92 3.87 4.19 4.01 5. How many times was class cancelled 4 2 0 1 1 9 43 4.74 776/1574 4.72 4.76 4.64 4.59 4. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 19 4 1 0 2 15 19 4.38 571/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 5. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 33 0 2 0 1 6 18 4.41 1286/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 16 4.63 514/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3. Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 41 0 1 0 1 1 1 6 4.63 514/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 15 6 4.00 ****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 1 1 5 6 4.00 *****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 3 4 7 11 22 9 3.47 1221/1342 3.66 3.86 4.32 4.19 13 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 19 1 5 12 10 9 3.57 1342/1520 3.54 3.84 4.25 4.09 3.50 dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 13 3 7 8 13 12 3.56 1225/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.02 3.01 written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 23 3 2 11 13 3 3.34 1285/1434 3.27 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.70 Was the grading system clearly explained 5 2 3 3 17 16 14 3.66 1276/1547 3.92 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.80 How many times was class cancelled 4 2 0 1 1 9 43 4.74 776/1574 4.72 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.19 4.10 3.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 5.10 4.10 5.10 5.10 5.10 5.10 5.10 5.10 5.10 5	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 13 3 7 8 13 12 3.56 1225/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.02 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 23 3 2 11 13 3 3.34 1285/1434 3.27 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.75 Was the grading system clearly explained 5 2 3 3 17 16 14 3.66 1276/1547 3.92 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.94 3.95 4.19 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 23 3 2 11 13 3 3.34 1285/1434 3.27 3.75 4.14 3.94 57. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 2 3 3 17 16 14 3.66 1276/1547 3.92 3.87 4.19 4.10 38. How many times was class cancelled 4 2 0 1 1 9 43 4.74 776/1574 4.72 4.76 4.64 4.59 49. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 19 4 1 0 2 15 19 4.38 571/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 38. Was lecture well prepared 40 0 1 2 1 2 14 4.30 1072/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 3.09 49. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 33 0 2 0 1 6 18 4.41 1286/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 49. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 16 4.63 514/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 39. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 ****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 4.35 4.09 39. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 39. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 39.	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 2 3 3 17 16 14 3.66 1276/1547 3.92 3.87 4.19 4.10 28   8. How many times was class cancelled 4 2 0 1 1 1 9 43 4.74 776/1574 4.72 4.76 4.64 4.59 4   9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 19 4 1 0 2 15 19 4.38 571/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 3    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 40 0 1 2 1 2 14 4.30 1072/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 3   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 33 0 2 0 1 6 18 4.41 1286/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65   4. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 41 0 1 0 1 1 16 4.63 514/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 13 4.16 1027/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 5   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 ****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 2    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3 5 7 7 16 3.74 1062/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3   4. Were special techniques successful	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled 4 2 0 1 1 9 43 4.74 776/1574 4.72 4.76 4.64 4.59 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 19 4 1 0 2 15 19 4.38 571/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 3    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 40 0 1 2 1 2 14 4.30 1072/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2	3.34
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 40 0 1 2 1 2 14 4.30 1072/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 33 0 2 0 1 6 18 4.41 1286/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 41 0 1 0 1 1 16 4.63 514/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 13 4.16 1027/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 ****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 2.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.4 Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/ 878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.91 3.91 3.91 3.91 3.91 3.91 3.91	3.66
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4.74
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 40 0 1 2 1 2 14 4.30 1072/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 33 0 2 0 1 6 18 4.41 1286/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.30 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 41 0 1 0 1 1 16 4.63 514/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 13 4.16 1027/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 ****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 2. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3 5 7 7 16 3.74 1062/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.91 3.91 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.0	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 33 0 2 0 1 6 18 4.41 1286/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 41 0 1 0 1 1 16 4.63 514/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 13 4.16 1027/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 5 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 ****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 2	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 41 0 1 0 1 1 16 4.63 514/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 13 4.16 1027/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 ****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 2    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3 5 7 7 16 3.74 1062/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3   4. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 40 1 1 3 1 1 13 4.16 1027/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 5 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 1 1 1 5 6 4.00 ****/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 2    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3    2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3 5 7 7 16 3.74 1062/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3    3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3    4. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.91	4.27
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.  3. Were special techniques successful  22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/ 878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91	3.80
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3 5 7 7 16 3.74 1062/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3  4. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91	3.59
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 8 2 13 6 9 3.16 1163/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3 5 7 7 16 3.74 1062/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3 4. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91	2.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3 5 7 7 16 3.74 1062/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3 4. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 7 1 8 8 14 3.55 1101/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3 4. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91	3.16
4. Were special techniques successful 22 3 6 4 6 5 14 3.49 715/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3	3.74
	3.55
Laboratory	3.49
Laboratory	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 *	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 ****	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities $58$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $2$ $5.00****/229***** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **$	***
4. Did the lab institution provide assistance 50 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 / 252 4.14 4.25 4.27	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 **	****
Seminar	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 50 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 / 05 5.00 4.72 4.52	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 50 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 4.09 4.52	***
3. Did lesearch projects contribute to what you rearned 30 0 0 0 0 2 3.00 / 72 3.00 4.04 4.45	****
1. Did presentations concribate to what you rearried 50 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 / 00 1.01 1.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 58 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 *	****
Field Work	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you rearned 50 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 / 52	***
2. Pla for clearly unacreating four evaluation criteria.	***
3. Mad the indirector available for compared ton	****
1. 10 what degree could for discuss four evaluations 30 0 0 0 0 2 3.00 / 13	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 58 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 **	****
Self Paced	
1. Did Sell-paced System Contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 1 3.00 4.44	****
2. Did beddy quebelons make eledi the expected godi 55 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 / 21 1.05 1.71	***
3. Wele your concacts with the instructor helpful 39 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 / 33 4.07 4.00	***
4. Was the reemback/tutoring by proctors herpful 39 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 / 20 4.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 58 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 382 **** 3.24 4.08 3.86 *	***

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 262 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 60

Instructor:

73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38	_		_	
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

#### Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 263 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

61 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eaner	ncies	<u>.</u>		Tngt	tructor	Course	Dent	IIMRC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
׫«»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1445/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1005/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1132/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1392/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1407/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1145/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	1	0		1493/1554		3.80	4.10	4.01	
J. How would you grade one overdir codoming cricocryonopp		ŭ	_	Ü		_	Ü	2.00	1170,1001	3.30	3.00	1.10	1.01	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	2	2	4	3.50	1388/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	1278/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1375/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	2	1	5	3.45	1329/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	0	5	2		997/1277				3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1043/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	2	3		1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	2	3		1163/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	464/ 878		3.88	4.05	3.91	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work					•	•							4 00	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	153/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	4.33
Calf David														
Self Paced	11	^	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 40	****	****	1 60	1 11	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	, 10	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24			4.83	4.71	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	***	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 12

Title

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 263 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 61 Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 264 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3 50	1445/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6		1005/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	3		1132/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	0	2		1392/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00		3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	2	0	0		1407/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	0	5		1145/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8		665/1574		4.76	4.64	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	5	0	0		1531/1554		3.80	4.10		3.40
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	2	U	5	U	U	4.43	1331/1334	3.50	3.00	4.10	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	5		1134/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	4		1366/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	3	2		1286/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	3	3		1293/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	856/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1043/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	2	3		1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	2	3		1163/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00			3.88	4.05	3.91	
Laboratory														
<del>_</del>		0	_	0	0	0	-	F 00	++++/ 024	****	4 00	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	-	0	1		****/ 232		4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	1		153/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03		4.33
Self Paced														
	11	0	٥	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 40	****	****	1 60	1 11	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11		0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, 10	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11 11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful					0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	, -	****		4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	U	0	U	1	5.00	****/ 382	^ ^ ^	3.24	4.08	3.86	^ ^ ^ <del>x</del>

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 61

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 264 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 12

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 12

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 265 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1445/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1005/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1132/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1392/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	850/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1407/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1145/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	805/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	3		1043/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	2	3		1091/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	2	3		1163/1269	3.63		4.35	4.09	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.00
- ,														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4 01	3.78	****
J. Were Criteria for grading made crear	10		U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 3/3		3.12	4.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	1		153/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	,	U	U	U	U	2	_	1.33	133/ 320	1.33	3.43	1.03	3.01	1.55
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
J. Were energy procedus for all the students		U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 302		J.4	1.00	5.00	

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 12 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 265 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

61

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 266 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 12

Title

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 266 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

61

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Instructor:

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 65

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 267 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

General  General  Description  One of the instructor make clear the expected goals of the instructor instructor to what you learned of the instructor instructor in the make clear the expected goal of the instructor instructor instructor in the make clear the expected goal of the instructor instructor instructor in the make clear the expected goal of the instructor instructor in the make clear the expected goal of the instructor instructor instructor in the make clear the expected goal of the instructor instructor in the make clear the expected goal of the instructor instructor in the make clear the expected goal of the instructor in the instructor in the make continue to what you learned the instructor in the i				Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, akills from this course   4	Questions	NR	NA		_			5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, akills from this course   4															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 5 5 2 12 11 3 9 3.26 1484/1576 3.58 3.92 4.27 4.18 3.26 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 5 5 5 21 21 11 34 233/1342 3.66 3.86 4.32 4.19 3.44 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 21 2 7 15 10 8 3.36 1413/1520 3.54 3.88 4.92 4.09 3.36 5.10 dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 8 1 7 12 15 17 37 1059/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.02 3.77 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 27 3 5 8 9 8 3.42 1251/1434 3.27 3.75 4.14 3.09 3.36 7.00 may times was class cancelled 4 0 4 6 17 17 17 3105/1467 3.92 3.87 4.10 4.01 3.61 8.10 m many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 3 2 9 46 4.63 357/1574 4.72 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.63 9.10 mover of the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 2 10 21 13 14 3.45 1397/1468 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.06 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 3 5 8 8 44 4.55 1377/14793 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.36 3.80 4.17 3.05 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2 0 5 5 21 21 11 3.44 1333/1342 3.66 3.86 4.32 4.19 3.44   1.03 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05   1.05 0.05 0.05   1.05 0.05 0.05   1.05 0.05 0.05   1.05 0.05 0.05   1.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05   1.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05				-											
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class class cancelled 8. How many times was clas			-	-	-										
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9. Did and overall presented and explained clearly 9. Did and overall teaching each shade you learned 9. Did the lecture material greatened and explained you learned 9. Did the lecture outribute to what you learned 9. Did the lecture material greatened and explained your understanding your learned 9. Did the lecture outribute to what you learned 9. Did the lecture outribute to what you learned 9. Did the lecture outribute to what you learned 9. Did the lecture outribute to what you learned 9. Did the lecture outribute to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Were encessary material available for lab and totivities 9. Were encessary material available for lab and totivities 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ***/ 85 *** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ***  1. Were necessary material available for	-														
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Journal of the word of the subject 1. Near the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. Did to learn the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did to learn the instructor encouraged to participate 2. Where all students actively encouraged to participate 2. Where special techniques successful 3. Where special techniques successful 4. Was the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Where all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Where special techniques successful 4. Did the learn through the description of the material 5. Did the description to what you learned 6. Did the learn through the description of the material 6. Did to learn through the description of the material 6. Did to learn through the description of the material 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Where special techniques successful 8. Where special techniques contribute to what you learned 8. Where special techniques successful 8. Where special techniques contribute to what you learned 8. On 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.															
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 22 1 2 12 14 10 4 3.05 1441/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.41  Lecture  Lecture swell prepared 5 0 0 2 10 21 13 14 3.45 1397/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.06  Lecture interructor seem interrested in the subject 5 0 0 3 5 8 44 4.55 1167/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.36  Mas lecture material prepented and explained clearly 7 0 10 13 15 9 11 297 1430/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.36  Mas lecture material prepared and explained clearly 1 1 9 9 11 16 12 3.23 1367/1489 3.91 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.70  Library  Library  Library  Library  Library  Library  Laboratory  Library  Laboratory  Library  Laboratory  Library  Library  Laboratory  Library															
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 2 1 2 12 14 10 4 3.05 1441/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.41 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 2 10 21 13 14 3.45 1397/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.06 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 3 5 8 44 4.55 1167/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.36 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 10 13 15 9 11 2.97 1430/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 1 9 9 11 16 3.59 983/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.89 16 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	-														
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   22   1   2   12   14   10   4   3.05   1441/1554   3.56   3.80   4.10   4.01   3.41				_											
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  5. 0 0 1 3 5 8 44 4.55 1167/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.06  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  7. 0 10 13 15 9 11 2.97 1430/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.70  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  7. 1 9 9 11 1 61 2 3.23 1387/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.71  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  14 5 4 6 11 9 16 3.59 983/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.89  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  21 0 6 6 10 12 10 3.32 1135/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.32  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  22 0 4 3 11 10 15 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.67  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  23 0 8 3 11 10 15 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.67  4. Were special techniques successful  24 2 5 5 6 7 16 3.62 685/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  5. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 *** 244 *** 4.22 4.23 4.08  2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 *** / 25 *** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ***  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 *** / 25 *** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ***  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 *** / 25 *** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ***  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  Field Work  A. Back and the subject of the subject o	-			-											
1. Never the instructor's lectures well prepared   5 0 0 2 10 21 13 14 3.45 1397/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.61 4.06	7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22		4	12	14	10	4	3.03	1441/1334	3.30	3.00	4.10	4.01	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 3 5 8 44 4.55 1167/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.36 3.70 4. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 10 13 15 9 11 2.97 1430/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 1 9 9 11 16 12 3.23 1387/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.71 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 5 4 6 11 9 16 12 3.23 1387/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.71 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 5 4 6 11 9 16 12 3.23 1387/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.71 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 5 4 6 11 9 16 3.59 983/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.89 Discussion Obscussion 21 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 3 5 8 44 4.55 1167/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.36 3.70 4. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 10 13 15 9 11 2.97 1430/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 1 9 9 11 16 12 3.23 1387/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.71 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 5 4 6 11 9 16 12 3.23 1387/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.71 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 5 4 6 11 9 16 12 3.23 1387/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.71 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 5 4 6 11 9 16 3.59 983/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.89 Discussion Obscussion 21 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	10	21	13	14	3.45	1397/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 5 4 6 11 9 16 3.59 983/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.89  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 6 6 10 12 10 3.32 1135/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.32 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 4 3 11 10 15 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.55 4.09 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 8 3 11 10 10 5 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.55 4.09 3.66 4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 5 5 6 6 7 16 3.62 685/ 878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.64 4.3 ****  Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.60 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.73 4.71 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 5. Did self-paced system con		5	0	0	3	5	8				4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.36
Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 6 6 10 12 10 3.32 1135/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.32 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 4 3 11 10 15 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 2 5 5 6 7 16 3.62 685/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62 4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 5 5 6 7 16 3.62 685/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	10	13	15	9	11	2.97	1430/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.70
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	9	9	11	16	12	3.23	1387/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.71
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 6 6 10 12 10 3.32 1135/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.32 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 4 3 11 10 15 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 8 3 11 10 10 3.26 1178/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.67 4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 5 5 6 7 16 3.62 685/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62 Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 5.06 4.74 4.20 4.15 **** 5.06 4.74 4.20 4.15 **** 5.06 4.74 4.20 4.15 **** 5.06 4.74 4.20 4.15 **** 5.06 4.74 4.20 4.15 **** 5.06 4.74 4.20 4.20 4.15 **** 5.06 4.74 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.2	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	5	4	6	11	9	16	3.59	983/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.89
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 6 6 10 12 10 3.32 1135/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.32 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 4 3 11 10 15 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 8 3 11 10 10 3.26 1178/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.62 4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 5 5 6 7 16 3.62 685/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62 Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 4.15 4.14 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.15															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 4 3 11 10 15 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.66 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 8 3 11 10 10 3.26 1178/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.26 4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 5 5 6 6 7 16 3.62 685/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 62 0 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 62 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.64 4.52 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.64 4.43 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ***/ 48 **** 4.64 4.43 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 8 3 11 10 10 10 3.26 1178/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.26 4.00 Were special techniques successful 24 2 5 5 6 6 7 16 3.62 685/878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62   Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 62 0 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.61 4.55 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 73 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.40 4.71 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.50 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** 4.67 4.68 ****															
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. O 0 0 2 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 4.24 4.25 4.23 4.08 ****  2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 ****  2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.49 4.51 4.55 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.44 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.44 4.20 ****  2. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				_	-										
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 62 0 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 62 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 229 *** 4.49 4.51 4.43 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 4.69 4.52 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 73 **** 4.61 4.55 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 73 **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.71 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.83 4.71 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.60 4.44 ****  3. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4.															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 62 0 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 ****/ 224 **** 4.28 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 329 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****    Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.64 4.43 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 48 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience shelp you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.57 4.71 **** 4.50 did field experience shelp you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.60 did field experience shelp you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.60 did field experience shelp you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.60 did field experience shelp y	4. were special techniques successful	24	2	5	5	ь	/	Τ6	3.62	685/ 8/8	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.62
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 62 0 0 2 0 1 0 2.67 ****/ 224 **** 4.28 4.23 4.08 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 329 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****    Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.64 4.43 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 48 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.50 did field experience shelp you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.57 4.71 **** 4.50 did field experience shelp you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.60 did field experience shelp you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.60 did field experience shelp you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.60 did field experience shelp y	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 **** 4.40 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 62 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 **** 232 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **** 4.50 4.51 4.52 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 **** 232 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 **** 232 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 **** 3.00 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 7.79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 7.79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 7.50 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 7.50 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** 5. Did grading made valuation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 **** 5.00 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.51 4.55 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 4.72 4.52 **** 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01		62	0	Ο	2	0	1	0	2 67	****/ 234	****	4 22	4 23	4 08	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 62 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.61 4.55 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** 4.60 4.44 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 **** 5. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** 4.78 4.65 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** 4.78 4.65 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** 4.78 4.65 ****	<u> </u>					-	_	-		, -	****				***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultations 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** 4.78 4.65 ****											****				****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 4.61 4.55 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.44 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ***/ 48 **** 4.44 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.73 4.71 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  4. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** 4.78 4.65 ****	-		0	0	0	2	0	0			****				****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.61 4.55 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****		63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.61 4.55 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.67 4.68 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.61 4.55 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.65 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.65 ****	-							•		,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****								-		,					
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 ****  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation  63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.47 4.11 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****   Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ***/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ***/ 24 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful  63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 25 **** 4.78 4.65 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****								-							
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****	-			-			-	-		,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****	5. were criteria for grading made clear	63	U	U	Τ	1	U	U	2.50	^^^^/ 3/5	***	3.12	4.01	3.78	* * * *
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****	Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****		63	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	Λ	Λ	3 00	****/ 50	****	****	4 4 9	4 20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.71 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****			-	-	-		-	•		,	****	****			
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****										, -	****	****			****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****											****	****			***
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****				0			0	0		, -	4.33	3.45			****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****			-	-			-	-		,				- · · · <del>-</del>	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****	Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 4.68 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****		63	0	0	-		-	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.78 4.65 ****		63	0	0			0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****		4.83	4.71	
1. Was the recastack tatoring by proceeds herpful 05 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 / 20 1.70 1.05								-		,					
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 382 **** 3.24 4.08 3.86 ****								-							
	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 72

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 267 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 65

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
tr. B) Spring 2009

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 65

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 268 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 65 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 268 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 65

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

University of Maryland

Page 269

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 4 0 4 5 20 19 13 3.52 1438/1576 3.68 3.94 4.30 4.11 3.52 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 3 9 28 13 9 3.26 1484/1576 3.58 3.92 4.27 4.18 3.26 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 5 5 21 21 11 3.44 1233/1342 3.66 3.86 4.32 4.19 3.44 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 21 2 7 15 10 8 3.36 1413/1520 3.54 3.84 4.25 4.09 3.36 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 8 1 7 12 15 17 3.77 1095/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.02 3.77 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 27 3 5 8 9 8 3.42 1251/1434 3.27 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.42 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 4 0 4 6 17 17 17 3.61 1303/1547 3.92 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.61 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 3 2 9 46 4.63 957/1574 4.72 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.63 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 25 4 1 2 8 17 8 3.81 1132/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 36 0 1 Ω 2 12 14 4.31 1064/1488 4.07 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.06 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 30 0 0 1 3 14 17 4.34 1316/1493 4.39 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.36 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 36 0 0 3 4 9 13 4.10 1069/1486 3.92 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 34 0 1 0 8 10 12 4.03 1102/1489 3.81 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.71 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 40 7 1 1 3 6 7 3.94 758/1277 3.83 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.89 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 6 10 12 10 3.32 1135/1279 3.56 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.32 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3 11 10 15 3.67 1087/1270 3.88 3.91 4.35 4.09 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 8 3 11 10 10 3.26 1178/1269 3.63 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.26 4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 7 16 3.62 685/ 878 3.84 3.88 4.05 3.91 3.62 Laboratory 0 2.67 ****/ 234 **** 4.22 4.23 4.08 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 2 0 1 3.67 **** / 240 **** 4.38 4.35 4.29 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 62 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.49 4.51 4.43 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 62 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.14 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.24 4.20 4.15 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 63 0 1 1 0 2.50 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 63 0 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.61 4.55 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** Field Work 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 63 0 0 0 2 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation  $63 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 2.50 **** / 44 **** **** <math>4.73 \ 4.71 \ ****$ 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.72 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 326 4.33 3.45 4.03 3.64 **** Self Paced 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 63 0 63 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 2 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 35 **** 4.67 4.68 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 63 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 28 **** 4.78 4.65 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 63 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 382 **** 3.24 4.08 3.86 **** Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 65

Instructor:

WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 269 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D) Spring 2009

Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 65

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 270 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	4	5	20	19	13	3.52	1438/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	9	28	13	9		1484/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	5	21	21	11		1233/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	2	7	15	10	8		1413/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	8	1	7	12	15	17	3.77	1095/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	3	5	8	9	8	3.42	1251/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	6	17	17	17	3.61	1303/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	3	2	9	46	4.63	957/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	4	1	1	4	19	11	4.06	897/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	3	12	13		1118/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	2	2	14	17		1331/1493		4.43	4.73	4.65	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	0	3	4	8	14		1047/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	8	9	13		1020/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	7	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	608/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	6	6	10	12	10		1135/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	4	3	11	10	15		1087/1270		3.91	4.35	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0 2	8 5	3 5	11	10	10		1178/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.26
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	5	5	6	7	16	3.62	685/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.62
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	***	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	1	1 2	0	0	2.50		****	5.00 ***	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63 63	0	0	1	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80 ****/ 375	****		4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	U	U	1	1	U	U	2.50	****/ 3/5		3.12	4.01	3.78	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	, -	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00		***	****	4.83	4.71	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	1	1 2	0	0	2.50	, -	****		4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	U	U	U	۷	U	U	3.00	****/ 382		3.24	4.08	3.86	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Instructor: Enrollment: 72

Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 270 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 55

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 271 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eane	ncie	g		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	16	16	18	3.84	1299/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	21	14	3.78	1303/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	6	8	23	16	3.92	1048/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	1	2	10	12	7	3.69	1290/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	7	14	19	4.05	829/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	3	1	8	5	6	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	8	18	25	4.23	871/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	9	42	4.75	758/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	2	9	14	12	1	3.03	1444/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	7	17	10	16	3.50	1388/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	4	8	40	4.56	1167/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	10	19	6	13	3.19	1396/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	12	8	10	8	13		1413/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	9	6	3	6	15	3.31	1095/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	3	12	11	8	3.42	1097/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	0	5	10	20	4.08	910/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	2	13	10	8		1116/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	1	5	6	6		3.84	.,		3.88		3.91	3.84
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	***
Self Paced														
	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	1 60	1 11	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54 54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.60 4.83	4.44 4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54 54	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54 54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.67	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 382	****	3.24	4.78	3.86	****
J. Here there enough proceds for all the scudents	JŦ	U	U	U	1	U	U	5.00	/ 302		3.44	T.00	5.00	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 55

nstr. A) Spring

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 271 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 55 Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 272 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	16	16	18		1299/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	21	14	3.78	1303/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	6	8	23	16	3.92	1048/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	1	2	10	12	7		1290/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	7	14	19	4.05	829/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	3	1	8	5	6		1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	8	18	25	4.23	871/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	9	42	4.75	758/1574		4.76	4.64	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	2	6	14	12	2	3.17	1415/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	2	0	7	8	17	4.12	1197/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	3	0	4	10	19		1384/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	4	2	6	9	13		1261/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	1	4	2	9	7	9		1319/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32		3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	8	5	1	6	5	6		1104/1277		3.72	4.03	3.91	
Discussion		•		_					4005/4050	0 = 6				
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	3	12	11	8		1097/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	0	5	10	20	4.08	910/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	2	13	10	8		1116/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	1	5	6	6	14	3.84	584/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.84
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 234	***	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
	Εĵ	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	E 00	1 72	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52 52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	5.00 ***	4.72 4.69	4.52 4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52 52	1	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.69	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
or note official for grading made official	02	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	_	1.07	, 3,3		3.12	1.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 382	***	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 55

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

University of Maryland Page 272 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 67

Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 273 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	16	16	18	2 0/	1299/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	21	14		1303/1576		3.92	4.27	4.11	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	6	8	23	16		1048/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	1	2	10	12	7		1290/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	7	14	19	4.05	829/1465		3.90	4.12	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	3	1	8	5	6	3.43	1245/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	8	18	25	4.23	871/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	9	42	4.75	758/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	0	2	5	17	11	4.06	897/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	2	1	1	6	12		1187/1488		4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	2	1	2	7	16		1370/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	2	0	2	9	10		1075/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	1	2	2	6	8		1162/1489		3.97	4.32		3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	10	2	0	3	3	3	3.45	****/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	3	12	11	8		1097/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	0	5	10	20	4.08	910/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3 1	2 5	13	10	8		1116/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35		3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	Т	5	6	6	14	3.84	584/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.84
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	1	3	0		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52 52	1 1	0	0	2	0	0 1	3.00 4.00	****/ 72 ****/ 80	****	5.00 ****	4.64 4.61	4.43 4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52 52	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	***
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	32	U	U	U	U		2	4.07	/ 3/3		3.12	4.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.30	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.33	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 55

Title

67

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 273 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 55

Erraluation Ouagtionnaire

Page 274 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	S	Spring	2009	
Student	Course	Evalua	tion	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 55

Title

Instructor:

Baltimore County MBUGUA, SAMUEL (Instr. D) Spring 2009

67

University of Maryland

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 274 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 275

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skill	s from this course	2	0	0	1	3	6	10	11	3.87	1266/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.87
			the expected goals		1	0	3	4	10	6	7	3.33	1463/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.33
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the expected goals	3	1	1	1	6	6	8	8	3.55	1196/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.55
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect t	the expected goals		2	8	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1103/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribut	e to what you lear	rned	2	3	2	3	6	6	9	3.65	1173/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contrib	oute to what you le	earned	2	11	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1204/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.50
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explained		2	1	2	1	3	9	13	4.07	992/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.07
8. How mar	ny times	was class cancel	led		3	0	0	2	0	4	22	4.64	942/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.64
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiv	reness	13	0	5	1	8	3	1	2.67	1514/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.92
		Lecture																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared		3	0	7	5	4	8	4	2.89	1462/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.09
			sted in the subject	;	4	0	2	4	3	1	17	4.00	1411/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.49
			and explained clea		6	0	5	4	5	8	3	3.00	1421/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13
		-	what you learned		5	1	7	1	4	6	7		1392/1489		3.97	4.32	4.22	4.12
			ance your understan	nding	4	2	2	6	4	6	7	3.40	1066/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.11
		Discussi	on															
1 Did als	ace dieau		ce to what you lear	med	15	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	758/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.13
			ouraged to particip		15	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.13	798/1279		3.91	4.35	4.09	4.13
			air and open discus		15	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	786/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	4.31
		chniques success			15	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	350/ 878		3.88	4.05		4.29
T. WELE BE	peciai te	ciniiques success	orur		13	2	1	U	1	-	O	1.27	3307 070	3.04	3.00	1.05	3.91	4.20
		Laborato	ry															
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab repor	ts clearly specifi	Led	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
		Self Pa	iced															
5. Were th	nere enou	gh proctors for	all the students		30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
				Freque	ncy	Dist	ribu	ıtio	n									
				_	-													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected G	Frades				Re	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0 A 6			Rec	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 2	-														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 6	5		Ger	neral	-				0	Under-g	rad 3	1	Non-	major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4 D 0)														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0)		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
			P 0)									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0)		Oth	ner				1	.6						
			? 0)														

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Baltimore County

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 31

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 276

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	1			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Games 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	10	11	2 07	1266/1576	3.68	2 0.4	4.30	4.11	2 07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	7	4	10	6	7		1463/1576			4.27	4.11	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	6	0			1196/1342			4.32	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	8	0	1	5	9			1103/1520					3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	6	6			1173/1465		3.90	4.12	4.02	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	2	6	2	9		1204/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	3	ט כ	2	13		992/1547		3.75	4.14	4.10	4.07
	2	0	0	2	0	4			942/154/			4.19		4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 14	1	1	0	9	4			1357/1554			4.10	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	Т	U	9	4	2	3.38	135//1554	3.50	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	q	0	1	1	2	7	10	4 09	1206/1488	4.07	4 24	4 47	4.41	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	6			1248/1493		4.43		4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	2	1	1	7			1158/1486		4.04		4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	3		11		1091/1489		3.97			4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	4	1	3	10		807/1277				3.91	
5. Did additivibual beeningdes chiance your understanding		_	-	-	_	5		3.03	007/1277	3.03	3.72	1.05	3.71	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	758/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	798/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	786/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	350/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.29
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.24	4.08	3.86	***
Frem	anas	Die	rib	1+ i o	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	16	-	•	_		
				2	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Instructor: GARRETT, TIMOTH (Instr. C)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 277 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	58			
Questionnaires:	31	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I 0

						Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did	d you qain n		ls from this course	0	0	1	3	6	10	11	3.87	1266/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.87
			the expected goals	1	0	3	4	10	6	7	3.33	1463/1576	3.58	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.33
3. Did	d the exam q	uestions reflect	the expected goals	1	1	1	6	6	8	8	3.55	1196/1342	3.66	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.55
4. Did	d other eval	uations reflect	the expected goals	2	8	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1103/1520	3.54	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95
5. Did	d assigned r	eadings contribu	te to what you learned	2	3	2	3	6	6	9	3.65	1173/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65
			bute to what you learned	2	11	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1204/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.50
		g system clearly		2	1	2	1	3	9	13	4.07	992/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	4.07
		was class cance		3	0	0	2	0	4	22	4.64			4.76	4.64	4.59	4.64
9. How	w would you	grade the overal	l teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	93/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.92
		Lecture															
1. Wer	re the instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.09
			sted in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	810/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.49
			and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	- ,		4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13
			what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	,		3.97	4.32	4.22	4.12
5. Did	d audiovisua	l techniques enh	ance your understanding	11	1	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	273/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.11
		Discuss															
			te to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	758/1279		3.80	4.17	3.96	4.13
			ouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	798/1270		3.91	4.35	4.09	4.31
			air and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	786/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	4.31
4. Wer	re special t	echniques succes	sful	15	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	350/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.29
		Laborat	-														
5. Wer	re requireme	nts for lab repo	rts clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.15	****
		Self P															
5. Wer	re there eno	ugh proctors for	all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
			Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 7 2	0.00-0.99	0 A 6					 or M			0	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55		1.00-1.99	0 B 2		re(quil	eu I	OT M	ajui	. D	U	Graduati	C	U	Ma JC) <u>.</u>	U
56-83		2.00-2.99	1 C 6		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 3	1	Non-	-major	31
84-15		3.00-3.49	4 D 0		001	c. u	-				J	onacı g.	3	_	1,011		31
Grad.		3.50-4.00	2 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
	· -		P 0								-	respons					•
														5-			

Other

16

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204 University of Maryland Page 278
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D) Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 31

58

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	10	11	3 87	1266/1576	3.68	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	10	6	7		1463/1576		3.92	4.27	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	6	6	8	8		1196/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	5	9			1103/1520		3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	6	6	9		1173/1465		3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	l 2	11	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1204/1434	3.27	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	3	9	13	4.07	992/1547	3.92	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	4	22	4.64	942/1574	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	237/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	736/1488	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1017/1493	4.39	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	379/1486	3.92	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	637/1489	3.81	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	283/1277	3.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	758/1279	3.56	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	798/1270	3.88	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	786/1269	3.63	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	350/ 878	3.84	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.29
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	***	4.24	4.20	4.15	***
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
Frec	uency	7 Dist	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				R-	ason	a a			Ty	ne			Majors	
Expected Glades	, . – – – -				.asuII	 			ту.	 5e				, . – – – –
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO Baltimore County Instructor:

Page 279 JUL 2, 2009 LACOURSE, WILLI Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6		
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation	Questionnaire

									Fre	-	ncies				tructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
			Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	1																
1. 1	Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this cou	ırse	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	4.83	3.94	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. 1	Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goa	ls	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.83	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. 1	Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected go	als	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	5.00	3.86	4.32	4.19	****
4. 1	Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goa	ls	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.50
7. 1	Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained		2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	755/1547	4.50	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.33
8. 1	How ma:	ny times	was class canc	elled			2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.25	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. 1	How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effec	tiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1554	5.00	3.80	4.10	4.01	****
			Lectur	e																
1. 1	Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared		2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.83	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.67
			ctor seem inter			ect	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1053/1493	4.83	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.67
3. 1	Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and	explained c	learly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.83	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.67
			es contribute t		-	-	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	888/1489	4.50	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.33
			l techniques en		-		2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			3.72	4.03	3.91	4.67
			Discus	sion																
1. 1	Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you l	earned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.83	3.80	4.17	3.96	5.00
			nts actively en		_		3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1270		3.91	4.35	4.09	5.00
			ctor encourage	_	_	_	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269		3.73	4.35		5.00
						Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Class :	dits E	awnad	Cum. GPA		Ermosts	d Crades				Dos	aor -				m				Modo	
Cree	uits E	arnea	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades					sons				Ту:	 be			Majors	
	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28	-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1														

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO Baltimore County Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

8

Page 280 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Dia	d wou gain r	Genera. new insights,skil	_	m this source	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	415/1576	4.83	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.67
		ictor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	4.83	3.92	4.27	4.18	5.00
		questions reflect			0	4	0	0	0	0	2		1/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	5.00
		uations reflect		_	0	3	0	0	0	0	3		1/1520	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.09	5.00
				what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1465	****	3.90	4.12	4.02	****
				o what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	3.75	4.14	3.94	5.00
		ng system clearly			0	0	0	0	1	0	5		, -	4.50	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.67
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	3	3		1079/1574	4.25	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.50
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1554		3.80			5.00
	-	3		J														
		Lecture																
		cuctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	4.83	4.24	4.47	4.41	5.00
		actor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	4.83	4.43		4.65	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1486	4.83	4.04	4.32	4.26	5.00
		res contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	500/1489	4.50		4.32	4.22	4.67
5. Dio	d audiovisua	al techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	4.83	3.72	4.03	3.91	5.00
		Discus			•		•		_		_		005/4050	4 00				4 65
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	5		335/1279		3.80	4.17	3.96	4.67
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91		4.09	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0 2	0	0	0	0	6		1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. we	re special t	echniques succes	ssiui		0	2	U	U	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	3.91	5.00
				Freq	iency	Dis	trib	ıtioı	n									
				1104	acric,	DID	C1 120	20101										
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-2	 7 1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4					or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-5!		1.00-1.99	0	B 0		Rei	quir	ea ro	OT MG	a JOE :	5	U	Graduat	=	U	Мајо)T	U
56-83		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Go:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	6
84-1		3.00-2.99	0	D 0		GE.	иста.	-				U	onder -g.	Luu	J	11011	iiia jul	U
Grad		3.50-4.00	5	F 0		E1	ecti	zes				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ıh
CIGG		3.33 1.30	5	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		Ot1	her					5		~			-	
				? 0								-						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 281 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	3	4	3.47	1456/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.47
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	9			1375/1576	4.11	3.92		4.18	3.58
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	6	2	3		1209/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	6	6	2		1362/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.50
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	7	5	3.72	1123/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.72
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	5	6	2	3.40	1263/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.40
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	4	7	3	3.26	1411/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.26
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	881/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.68
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	13	3	4.06	897/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.09
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	870/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.82
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	868/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.96
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	944/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.74
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1162/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.37
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	6	4	1	3.31	1095/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.31
	Discussion														
1	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2 67	****/1279	3.44	3 80	4.17	3.96	****
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
	Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 878		3.88	4.05	3.91	***
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	171/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.95
	Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	189/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.11
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.37
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	5	1	4	6	2	2.94	223/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	2.94
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	339/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.84
	Frequ	en at	Diet	-rih	ıti o	n									
	riequ	ciicy	ומדמ	الدد در	исто	-11									

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: MALINOWSKI, MAT (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 282

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	2	10	3	4	3.47	1456/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.47
		tor make clear			0	0	0	2	6	9	2	3.58	1375/1576		3.92	4.27	4.18	3.58
		estions reflec			0	7	1	0	6	2	3		1209/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50
		ations reflect			0	3	0	2	6	6	2		1362/1520		3.84	4.25	4.09	3.50
				what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	7	5	3.72	1123/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.72
				to what you learned	0	4	2	0	5	6	2		1263/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.40
		system clearl		ained	0	0	3	2	4	7	3		1411/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	3.26
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	881/1574		4.76	4.64	4.59	4.68
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	6	5	4	2	0	2.12	1546/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.09
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			4	0	3	1	4	5	2	3.13	1442/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.82
		tor seem inter			4	0	1	3	7	1	3	3.13	1488/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.96
				explained clearly	4	0	2	2	3	7	1	3.20	1392/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.74
		s contribute t			4	0	4	2	4	3	2	2.80	1451/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.37
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	4	11	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.31
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were a	all studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did th	ne instruc	tor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	ssful		16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the material	0	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	171/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.95
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequa	te bacl	ground information	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	189/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.11
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable i	for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.37
4. Did th	ne lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	stance	1	0	5	1	4	6	2	2.94	223/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	2.94
5. Were r	requiremen	ts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	0	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	339/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.84
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 4	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Por			or Ma			1	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	A 2 B 8		Rec	4utr.	eu I	OT Mg	ישטני	۵	_	Graduat	C	J	ria JC) <u>T</u>	U
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		001	u.	_				•	onder 9			1,011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		E] e	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	3	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.7	10000110		91			
				1 0		UCI					1	. ,						

?

0

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102 Univ

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 283 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	1	0	2	4	1	6	5	3.44	1467/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.44
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1275/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.83
		uestions reflect			1	4	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1209/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	2	2	2	2	4	6	3.63	1320/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.63
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	1	1	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	1180/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.65
5. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	2	6	3.60	1172/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.60
. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	/ explai	ned	1	0	2	4	1	6	5	3.44	1366/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.44
B. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	813/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.72
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	4	2	0	3	4	4	2	3.38	1355/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.29
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures			1	0	0	2	1	5	10		1095/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.07
		ctor seem intere		3	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	1296/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.01
		terial presented			1	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1025/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.90
		es contribute to			1	0	3	1	4	4	6	3.50	1313/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.39
. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	1	2	4	4	1	2	5	3.00	1149/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.78
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu			12	0	2	2	1	1	1		1242/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	2.57
		nts actively end			12	0	2	0	1	2	2		1177/1270		3.91	4.35	4.09	3.29
		_		open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	1	2		1199/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.14
. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		12	2	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	742/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.40
		Laborat	cory															
L. Did th	e lab ind	crease understar	nding of	the material	4	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00
. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequat	e backg	round information	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	162/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.20
. Were n	ecessary	materials avail	lable fo	r lab activities	4	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	217/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	3.87
		structor provide			4	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	185/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.80
. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	4	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	334/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.87
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	 ior	 s	1	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В 3						,	-		2_ 3.3.400	-	-) ~	-	_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	1						
				2 0														

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title NGUYEN, DUONG (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 19

24

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 284

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	0						

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 285 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ω	0	0	6	5	5	6	3 50	1445/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	7	4		1382/1576		3.92	4.27	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	6	3	2		1209/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	4	6	6	1		1461/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	4	9	3.90		4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	7	3	2	3.13	1349/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	10	5	4	3.43	1373/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	832/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	816/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	870/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	868/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50			4.04	4.32	4.26	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	4	10		1070/1489		3.97	4.32	4.22	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	3	3	2	5	3.50	1020/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	2	5	1	2	2 53	1246/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	2.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	5	2	2	2	4		1232/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	6	3	1		1235/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	2	2	0	2	0		858/ 878		3.88	4.05	3.91	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	188/ 234		4.22	4.23	4.08	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	109/ 240		4.38	4.35	4.29	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	190/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0 2	2	1 2	4	5 2	8 11	3.80 4.22	185/ 232		4.14	4.29	4.27	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	U	2	3	2	11	4.22	165/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-		5	
				?	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 286 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General	 I															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	6	5	5	6	3.50	1445/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	8	7	4	3.55	1382/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.55
3. Did t	he exam qu	uestions reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	9	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1209/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.50
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	4	1	4	6	6	1	3.11	1461/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.11
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	1	0	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	989/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.90
				what you learned	2	5	2	1	7	3			1349/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.13
		g system clearly		ned	1	0	2	0	10	5			1373/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	3.43
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	6			832/1574		4.76	4.64	4.59	4.71
9. How w	ould you	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	4	2	8	6	0	2.80	1501/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.47
		Lecture	9															
		uctor's lectures			5	0	4	1	7	3	2		1463/1488		4.24	4.47	4.41	3.69
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear!			_	4	0	3	2	3	9	1		1487/1493		4.43	4.73	4.65	3.97
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl				5	0	4	1	5	6	1		1434/1486		4.04	4.32	4.26	3.72
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				5	1	4	2	5	4	1		1455/1489	3.90	3.97		4.22	3.42
5. Did a	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin				4	9	4	1	1	2	1	2.44	1244/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.97
	Discussion																	
		ussions contribu			7	0	5	2	5	1	2		1246/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	2.53
		nts actively end			7	0	5	2	2	2	4		1232/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.87
		-		open discussion	7	0	3	2	6	3	1		1235/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	2.80
4. Were	special to	echniques succes	ssful		6	10	2	2	0	2	0	2.33	858/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	2.33
		Laborat	cory															
1. Did t	he lab ind	crease understar	nding of	the material	2	0	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	188/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.85
		_	_	round information	2	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	109/ 240		4.38	4.35	4.29	4.45
	_			r lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	10		4.20	190/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.20
		structor provide			2	0	2	1	4	5	8	3.80	185/ 232		4.14	4.29	4.27	3.80
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	2	2	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	165/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.22
		Seminar																
	_	topics relevant			21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was t	he instru	ctor available f	for indi	vidual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
	Fre					Dist	tribu	utic	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
	00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 11					кес	4ulre	eu I	or M	ajor	S	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	DT.	1
	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 4 C 2					Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad ?	2	Non-	-major	21
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D 0						GGI	c. u.	-				5	onaci g		-	14011		21
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_j h
	P 0												respons				_	•
	P 0										1	_					-	

Other

16

I

?

0

1

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104 University of Maryland

Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 287 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Quescionn	alles. 2	21	Scudenc Coo	ILDE	Буат	uati	OII Q	uest	10111	ialle	•						
						Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	rom this course	0	0	1	2	3	13	5	3.79	1329/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.79
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	13	6	3.96	1187/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.96
3. Did th	ie exam qu	uestions reflect the	expected goals	0	5	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1072/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.89
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect the ϵ	expected goals	0	3	2	0	2	13	4	3.81	1232/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.8
. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	647/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.2
. Did wr	itten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	5	0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1105/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.7
. Was th	e grading	g system clearly expl	ained	0	0	1	6	8	5	4	3.21	1422/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.2
B. How ma	ny times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	13	11	4.46	1140/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.4
		grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	11	5	3.91	1060/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.9
		Lecture															
L. Were t	he instru	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	2	1	0	7	14	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.1
		ctor seem interested		0	0	0	2	0	2			1053/1493		4.43	4.73	4.65	4.4
		terial presented and	3	0	0	2	2	2	7			1149/1486			4.32		
		es contribute to what		0	0	5	2	3	8			1363/1489		3.97			
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	1	3	4	2	3.70	923/1277				3.91	3.7
		Discussion															
I. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1161/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.1
. Were a	ll studer	nts actively encourag	ged to participate	18	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1243/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.6
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage fair a	and open discussion	18	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1195/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.1
1. Were s	special te	echniques successful	-	17	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	***
		Laboratory															
l. Did th	e lab ind	crease understanding	of the material	6	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	153/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.1
. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequate bac	kground information	6	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	84/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.5
		materials available		6	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	172/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.3
		structor provide assi		6	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	161/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.0
		nts for lab reports o		6	1	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	218/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.0
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Τv	pe			Majors	5		
		Cum. GPA											- 				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 17		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	В 2		_		-				•	1	, .				
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 2		Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	24
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 4 D 0											_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -					ſh
			Р 0									respons	es to k	e sign	nifican	nt	
			- ^		0.1					_							

Other

20

I

?

0

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: COURTNEY, TIM (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 288 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions				Fre	equei	ncie	S		Tng	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 0 1 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Was the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's eminterested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Discussion 1. Discussion 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were special techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Were special techniques successful 1. To 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	Questions	NR	NA		2		4	5				_	-		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 0 1 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Was the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's eminterested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Discussion 1. Discussion 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Were special techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Were special techniques successful 1. To 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	G														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 0 4 13 6 3.96 1187/1576 4.11 3.92 4.27 4.18 3.96 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 1 3 8 6 3.86 1072/1342 3.93 3.86 4.32 4.19 3.89 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 2 3 4 3.81 1232/1520 3.83 3.84 4.25 4.09 3.81 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 2 8 9 4.25 647/1465 4.09 3.90 4.12 4.02 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 3 4 7 5 3.74 1105/1343 3.81 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.74 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 6 8 5 4 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 1 6 8 5 4 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 4 4.06 1140/1574 4.74 4.76 4.64 4.99 4.66 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 2 3 4 7 4.00 1233/1488 4.25 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.13 4.13 4.13 4.13 4.13 4.13 4.13		0	0	1	2	2	1 2	_	2 70	1220/1576	2 0 1	2 04	4 20	1 11	2 70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 1 1 1 3 8 6 6 3.89 1072/1342 3.93 3.86 4.32 4.19 3.89 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 2 0 2 13 4 3.81 1232/1520 3.83 3.84 4.25 4.09 3.81 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 2 8 8 9 4.25 647/1465 4.09 3.90 4.12 4.02 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 3 4 7 5 3.74 1105/1434 3.81 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.74 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 6 8 5 4 3.21 1452/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 13 11 4.46 1140/1574 4.74 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 2 3 4 7 7 4.00 1233/1488 4.25 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.13 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 1 3 3 4 9 4.24 1362/1493 4.38 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 1 2 3 2 8 3.88 1207/1486 4.16 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.92 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 4 3 7 3.88 1205/1489 3.90 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 11 1 1 2 0 2.80 ****/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.70 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 4.04 4.05 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09		_	-	1	_	-		_							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 2 0 2 13 4 3.81 1232/1520 3.83 3.84 4.25 4.09 3.81 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 2 8 9 4.25 647/1465 4.09 3.90 4.12 4.02 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 3 4 7 5 3.74 1105/1434 3.81 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.74 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 6 8 5 4 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 6 8 5 4 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 1.00 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 1.00 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 1.00 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 1.00 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 1.00 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1		•	5	_	1			-		- ,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 1 2 8 9 4.25 647/1465 4.09 3.90 4.12 4.02 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 3 4 7 5 3.74 1105/1434 3.81 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.74 1.05/1434 3.81 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.74 1.05/1434 3.81 3.75 4.19 4.10 3.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 13 11 4.46 1140/1574 4.74 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 2 3 4 7 4.00 1233/1488 4.25 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.13 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 1 3 4 9 4.24 1362/1493 4.38 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.45 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 Loid the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 1 3 4 9 4.24 1362/1493 4.38 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.45 3.80 3.80 4.00 4.01 3.91 Discussion 2 8 3.88 1207/1486 4.16 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.92 4.20 3.05 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 11 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 ****/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.70 Discussion 5 1 2 3 2 8 3.88 1207/1489 3.90 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 11 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 ****/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.70 Discussion 6 1 2 1 2 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 1 0 5 12 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.71 4.00 3.91 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 0 1 0 5 1 0 0 2.50 ****/878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 3. Were special techniques successful 7 6 0 0 1 0 5 6 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	<u>.</u>	•	3	_	U			-							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 3 4 7 5 3.74 1105/1434 3.81 3.75 4.14 3.94 3.74 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 6 8 5 4 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 13 11 4.46 1140/1574 4.74 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 Lecture		_	-		-	_		9							
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 6 8 5 4 3.21 1422/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 13 11 4.46 1140/1574 4.74 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 2 3 3 4 7 4.00 1233/1488 4.25 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.13 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 1 3 4 9 4.24 1362/1493 4.38 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.45 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 Lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 1 2 3 2 8 3.88 1207/1486 4.16 4.04 4.32 4.25 3.92 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 4 3 7 3.88 1205/1489 3.90 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 11 1 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 ****/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.70 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.81 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 *****/878 3.45 3.83 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2.00 2.50 *****/878 3.45 3.83 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3.92 4.05 3.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4			5	•	_	_	7	5							
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 5 9 6 3.90 1060/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 3.91 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 2 3 4 7 4.00 1233/1488 4.25 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.13 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 1 3 4 9 4.24 1362/1493 4.38 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 1 2 3 2 8 3.88 1207/1486 4.16 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.92 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 4 3 7 3.88 1205/1489 3.90 3.97 4.32 4.26 3.92 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 11 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 ****/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.70 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 *****/ 878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 Frequency Distribution		-	0	-		_	5	-		,					
Lecture Lect	3 3 1 1 1		-	_	-	-		_		, -					
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			-	-	-	-				-, -					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	J. How would jou grade one overdir oddoning circoorveness		Ü	_	ŭ	-		Ū	3.70	1000, 1001	3.00	3.00	1.10	1.01	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 1 3 4 9 4.24 1362/1493 4.38 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 1 2 3 2 8 3.88 1205/1486 4.16 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.92 4.01 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 4 3 7 3.88 1205/1489 3.90 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 11 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 ****/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.70 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 *****/878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/ 234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/ 240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/ 229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4.35 4.29 4.56 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/ 379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 6 4.06 218/ 379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 1 3 4 9 4.24 1362/1493 4.38 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 1 2 3 2 8 3.88 1205/1486 4.16 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 4 3 7 3.88 1205/1489 3.90 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 11 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 ****/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.70 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 *****/878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/ 234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/ 240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/ 229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4.36 4.05 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/ 379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 6 4.06 218/ 379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06		8	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1233/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 1 2 3 2 8 3.88 1207/1486 4.16 4.04 4.32 4.26 3.92 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 1 4 3 7 3.88 1205/1489 3.90 3.97 4.32 4.22 3.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 11 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 ****/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 3.70 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06		7	0	0	1	3	4	9		,				4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	- The state of the	8	0		2			8		,					
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06		8	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1205/1489	3.90		4.32	4.22	3.60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** / 878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06		8	11	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/1277	3.43			3.91	3.70
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 3 0 3.17 1161/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** / 878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1243/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 1 1 1 2 1 3.17 1195/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 5 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1161/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.17
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1243/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	2.67
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1195/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.17
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/ 234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/ 240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/ 229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/ 232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/ 379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 Frequency Distribution	4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 4 5 8 4.11 153/ 234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/ 240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/ 229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/ 232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/ 379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 Frequency Distribution															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 1 0 5 12 4.56 84/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 Frequency Distribution	Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 2 0 6 10 4.33 172/229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 Frequency Distribution	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	153/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.11
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 3 2 4 9 4.06 161/232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.06 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 Frequency Distribution	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	84/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 218/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.06 Frequency Distribution	3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0				6	10	4.33			4.49		4.43	4.33
Frequency Distribution	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	161/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.06
	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	218/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.06
	Freq			rib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				D.c.	2 4 0	a			m				Majors	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				2	0						

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

Baltimore County SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Page 289 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	6	7		1316/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	10		1113/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	886/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	3	6	6	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	513/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	758/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	1013/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	10		1079/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	12	4	3.95	992/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	932/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	16		1029/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	749/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	11		1042/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32		3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	2	7	2	4		1111/1277		3.72	4.03	3.91	
5. Did dudiovibual techniques chiance your anderstanding	_	•	2	2	,	2	-	3.21	1111/12//	3.13	3.72	1.05	3.71	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1014/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	928/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1095/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	99/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	81/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	129/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	1	5	2	9	3.79	186/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	182/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.18
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	***** 05		F 00	4 50	4 50	ale ale ale ale
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 72	***	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	***	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****			****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	U T	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.83	4.71 4.68	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.67 4.78	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	U T	1		****/ 382			4.78	3.86	****
5. were there enough proctors for all the students	۷۷	Τ	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.80	

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 289 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 290 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	6	7	3.82	1316/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	1113/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	886/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	3	6	6	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	513/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	758/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	1013/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	1079/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	7	7	1	3.10	1431/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	4	0	2	7	3	3.31	1422/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	3	2	0	8	3	3.38	1480/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	4	1	2	7	2	3.13	1409/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	3	1	3	4	4		1363/1489	3.90	3.97			3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	10	1	0	2	0	1		****/1277	3.43			3.91	3.24
1 1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1014/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	928/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	3		1095/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	0	2	1		****/ 878	3.45	3.88		3.91	****
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	99/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	81/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	129/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	1	5	2	9	3.79	186/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	182/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.18
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67		****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
									,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1			****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 382		3.24	4.08	3.86	****
		_	-	-	-	-	_		, 552					

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 290 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 19

Instructor:

Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept. UMBC Level Sect.

Page 291

JUL 2, 2009

			Fre	equer	ncıe	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	rever	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	5	4	3.47	1456/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	9	4		1356/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	0	4	3	3.70	1155/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	7	2	3.22	1444/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1138/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1117/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	2	4	5	3.16	1435/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	12	6	4.21	1353/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	8	5	1	3.50	1303/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1171/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1113/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	1158/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	1385/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	4	4	0	5	1	2.64	1222/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	0	1	3 50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	1	0		****/1270		3.91	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	3	0	0		****/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 878		3.88	4.05	3.91	****
- 1														
Laboratory	_			•		_	_		100/004	4 00		4 00	4 00	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	183/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0		7	11	4.12	186/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.12
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	U T	⊥ 1	3 6	11	4.29	181/ 229 184/ 232	4.37	4.49	4.51 4.29	4.43	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3 1	1	J	6	, 6	3.82	184/ 232 329/ 379	4.09 4.24	4.14	4.29	4.27 4.15	3.82 3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	U	Т	Т	3	ю	О	3.88	349/ 3/9	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.00

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

University of Maryland Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 19

Instructor:

Page 292 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	c c		Tnei	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evre1	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	5	4		1456/1576		3.94	4.30	4.11	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	9	4		1356/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	3	0	4	3		1155/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	7	2		1444/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	4	6		1138/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	2	4	5		1117/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	2	4	5		1435/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	12	6	4.21	1353/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	9	3	1	3.07	1437/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1329/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	1	2	3		1445/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	3	0	3		1101/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	2		1283/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	2	1	2	0	2		1198/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03		2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	0	1		****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	1	0		****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	3	0	0		****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	183/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	186/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.12
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	181/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	0	1	6	7	3.82	184/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	329/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.88
Frequ	ana:	Diat	-rib	ıt i or	,									
rrequ	енсу	ומדמ	-1100	LLOI	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	=			
				2	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 24

SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 293 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equer	cies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain nev	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1118/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.06
		tor make clear			1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	785/1576	4.11		4.27	4.18	4.39
		estions reflec			1	2	0	1	2	7		4.13	925/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13
		ations reflect			1	2	1	1	3	5	6		1185/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.88
				what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	778/1465		3.90	4.12	4.02	4.13
	_	-		o what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	4	6		1015/1434			4.14		3.88
		system clearl		-	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	908/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	4.19
		was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574		4.76	4.64	4.59	4.94
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	702/1554		3.80	4.10	4.01	3.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.47
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	1		4.94	334/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.26
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2		4.76	325/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32		4.26
		s contribute t			2	0	0	0	3	3		4.47	731/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32		3.83
				our understanding	2	6	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	909/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	
J. Dia aa	aiovibuai	ccciniiques cii	nance y	our understanding	2	Ü	Ü	3	-	3	•	3.73	505/12//	3.13	3.72	1.05	3.71	3.30
ו הוא מ		Discus			1.0	0	0	0	1	^	2	4 22	++++/1070	2 44	2 00	4 17	2 06	****
		what you learned	16 16	0	0	0	1 1	0	2		****/1279		3.80	4.17	3.96	****		
	re all students actively encouraged to participa						-	-	1	-	2		****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
	d the instructor encourage fair and open discuss re special techniques successful					0 1	0	0	2	0			****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. were s	pecial tec	chiniques succe	SSLUI		15	Т	U	U	2	U	Τ	3.67	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	
		Labora	_						_	_	_							
				f the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 234		4.22	4.23	4.08	4.44
				ground information	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	84/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56
				or lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2		4.56	123/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.56
		tructor provid			10	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	209/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	3.44
5. Were r	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	10	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	229/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.00
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors fo	r all t	he students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55												•						
56-83							nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19
84-150												_						
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0							ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0							_		respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	4						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 19

WALI, ALI (Instr. B)

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 294 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equer	cies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain nev	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1118/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.06
		tor make clear			1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	785/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.39
		estions reflec			1	2	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	925/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	2	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1185/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.88
				what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	778/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.13
6. Did wr	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1015/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.88
		system clearl			3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	908/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.19
8. How man	ny times v	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.94
9. How wo	uld you gr	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	3	0	4	5	3	3.33	1367/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	8	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1233/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.47
		tor seem inter			7	0	1	2	2	3	4		1468/1493		4.43	4.73	4.65	4.26
				xplained clearly	7	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1253/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.26
		s contribute t			8	0	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1395/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.83
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	7	5	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.36
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	what vou learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****		
	d class discussions contribute to what you learn re all students actively encouraged to participa					0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1270		3.91	4.35	4.09	****
						0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	****
	d the instructor encourage fair and open discuss re special techniques successful					1	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 878			4.05	3.91	****
		Labora	+0227															
1 Did th	e lah ing		-	f the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.44
			_	ground information	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	,		4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56
				or lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	- ,		4.49	4.51	4.43	4.56
		tructor provid			10	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44			4.14	4.29	4.27	3.44
				early specified	10	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00			4.24	4.20	4.15	4.00
3	o qual omorr	00 101 100 105	0100 01	carry spectrica		_	_	Ü	_	_	-	1.00	227, 373			1.20	1113	1.00
Г Б . а		Field		1.1.3	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 226	2 00	2 45	4 02	2 64	++++
5. Dia co	nierences	neip you carr	y out i	ield activities	18	0	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	^ ^ ^ ^
		Self			17													
5. Were t	Were there enough proctors for all the students					0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	:			Tv	ре			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55						_						•	1	, -	•			
56-83							nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19
84-150												•						
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						ectiv	ves				0	#### -				_	ın
				- 0		0.1					-	4	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1C	
		I 0		Otl	ner				1	4								

? 0

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 295 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	Cource	Evaluation	Ougetion	nnaire

Quescioni	iaiics. i	- 1	beadene coe	il bC	Буат	uacı	OII Q	ucbc.	101111	alle	-						
						Fr	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		
		General															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights, skills from	om this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1073/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.13
		tor make clear the e		1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31			3.92	4.27	4.18	4.31
		estions reflect the	_	1	2	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	972/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.00
		ations reflect the e		1	2	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1199/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.86
		adings contribute to		4	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	850/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	704/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.23
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly expla	ained	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	737/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.36
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.93
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	924/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	750/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.30
		ctor seem interested		2	0	0	0	1	3	11		1053/1493		4.43	4.73	4.65	4.15
		erial presented and		2	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33				4.32		3.89
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	997/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.05
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	2	5	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	974/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.47
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	assions contribute to	what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
		its actively encourage	_	14	0	1	1	1	0	0		****/1270		3.91		4.09	****
		ctor encourage fair a		14	0	1	1	1	0	0		****/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	****
		chniques successful	-	14	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 878				3.91	****
		Laboratory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	crease understanding	of the material	6	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	193/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.82
		led with adequate back		6	0	0	0	4	2		4.09	189/ 240		4.38	4.35	4.29	4.09
_	_	materials available	_	6	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.36
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provide assis	stance	7	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	137/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.30
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab reports c	learly specified	5	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	128/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.33
		Seminar															
5. Were d	riteria f	or grading made clear	r	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
		Self Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for all	the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
			Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
			-														
Credits E	larned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re 	ason:	S 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55 56-83	8 1	1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 1	B 3 C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0								-	J				5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
			P 0			_						respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
			I O		Ot:	her				1	.3						
			? 0														

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17

NGUYEN, DUONG (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 296 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights, skills fr	om this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1073/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.13
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	877/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.31
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect the	expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	972/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect the e	xpected goals	1	2	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1199/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.86
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribute to	what you learned	4	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	850/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contribute	to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	704/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.23
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly expl	ained	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	737/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.36
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.93
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	7	2	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.50
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	6	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1233/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.30
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem interested	in the subject	6	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1464/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.15
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	6	0	0	2	5	1	3	3.45	1346/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.89
		s contribute to what		7	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1192/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.05
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	6	5	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	1086/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.47
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribute to	what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
		ts actively encourage		14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
		tor encourage fair a		14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques successful	-	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
		Laboratory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understanding	of the material	6	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	193/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.82
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequate bac	kground information	6	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	189/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.09
3. Were n	ecessary	materials available	for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.36
4. Did th	e lab ins	tructor provide assi	stance	7	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	137/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.30
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab reports c	learly specified	5	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	128/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.33
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made clea	r	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
		Self Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for all	the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
			Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
		0.00-0.99 0	 A 9										- 				
00-27 28-55	1 8	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 9 B 3		кес	4ulr	eu I	or Ma	Jor	ಶ	0	Graduat	E	0	Majo	JT.	1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	в 3 С 1		Cer	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		061	с.а.	-				J	onaci -g.	Luu I		14011		10
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h	
			P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
		5 0 I 0		Otl	her				1	3							

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109 University of Maryland Title

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Baltimore County

SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 22

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 297 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

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

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: BEDIAKO, BERNIC (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 298 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	10	5	3.82	1316/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	5	3.86	1259/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1093/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	8	5	6		1276/1520		3.84	4.25	4.09	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	688/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	1	1	6	6	6		1093/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	3	7	3		1422/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	18		469/1574			4.64	4.59	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	1	6	6	2		1267/1554			4.10		3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	9	4	3.80	1343/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	6	9	5	3.95	1426/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	10	4	5	3.60	1307/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	6	4		1305/1489		3.97	4.32	4.22	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	0	1	2	3	3	3.89			3.72	4.03	3.91	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	2	0		****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory	_					_	_	4 00	4554 004	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 00	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00			4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47			4.38	4.35	4.29	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	,		4.49	4.51	4.43	3.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	7	5	4	3.71	,			4.29	4.27	3.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	344/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	3.82
Seminar	0.1	0	0	0	^	1	0	4 00	++++/ 05	****	г оо	4 70	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79			4.69	4.52	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72		5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80		****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 326	3 00	3 45	4 03	3.64	****
						-	Ü	1.00	, 320	3.00	3.13	1.03	3.01	
	uency	DIST	crib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason:	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	S
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 28-55 11 1.00-1.99 0 B 7		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	21
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 10 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
P 0									respons	es to h	na ciar	ifianr	n t	

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 299 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did voi	ı gain new	insights, ski		this course	0	0	0	4	2	9	7	3.86	1274/	1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.86
		or make clear			0	0	0	2	5	6	9		1138/			3.92	4.27	4.18	4.00
		stions reflec			0	6	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	925/		3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13
		cions reflect			0	2	1	0	5	7	7		1103/		3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95
				hat you learned	1	2	1	0	3	5	10	4.21				3.90	4.12	4.02	4.21
	_	-		what you learned	1	3	2	2	2	10	2		1239/		3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.44
		system clearly			1	0	0	4	1	11	_		1219/		3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.81
		as class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	. ,	1574		4.76	4.64	4.59	5.00
				ing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	10					3.80	3.80		4.01	
		Lecture	9																
1 Ware +h	ne instruct	cor's lecture	_	repared	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	666/	1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.67
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	279/		4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.98
				plained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6		4.57	- ,		4.16	4.04	4.32		4.65
		contribute to			1	0	3	1	3	3	11		1214/		3.90	3.97	4.32		4.00
			_	ur understanding	1	6	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	856/					3.91	
J. DIG au	IIOVISUAI (eciniiques em	nance yo	ur understanding	1	U			1	J	O	3.00	0307	12//	3.43	3.72	1.03	3.91	3.90
1 544	Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you lear:				1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 22	1100/	1070	2 44	2 00	4 1 7	2 06	2 22
	lass discussions contribute to what you learn all students actively encouraged to participa				16 17	0	2 1	0	0	2	2		1129/		3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.33
		_				-	_	-	-	_	2		****/		3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
				open discussion	17	0 3	1	0	0	1	3		****/		3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. were sp	pecial teci	niques succe	ssiui		17	3	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	****/	8/8	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	* * * *
		Labora	-																
				the material	2	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	129/		4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.25
				round information	2	0	0	0	1	-	16	4.75	- ,	240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.75
				r lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	83/	229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.70
		ructor provid			2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70		232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.70
5. Were re	equirements	s for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	64/	379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.60
		Field	Work																
1. Did fie	eld experie	ence contribu	te to wh	at you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you	ı clearly ι	understand yo	ur evalu	ation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
		or available :			21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what	degree co	ould you disc	uss your	evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	45	***	****	4.57	4.72	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı										
Credits Ea	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr:							Rea	sons	5				Тур	pe			Majors	;
00.07	· -											1							
00-27 28-55	3 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 7					кес	quire	ea IC	or Ma	Jor	ಶ	1	Gra	duate	E	0	Majo	DT.	2
28-55 56-83						Cor	neral					1	ביוו	02-03	rad o	12	Non	maion	20
84-150						Gel	ıcıdl	-				Τ.	UIIG	er-gı	rau 2	. 4	NOI1-	-major	∠∪
84-150 Grad.						- רים	ectiv	TO C				0	шшп	4 . *	Means t	horo -	.xo xo+	ono	rh
Grau.						т⊥∈	-CLIV	CS				U			means t es to b			_	111
	P 0 I 0					Oth	ner				1	7	TES.	POITE	LD LU L	,c argi.	Cal	10	
				? 1		OCI	ıCI.					,							

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: COURTNEY, TIM (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 300 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions							equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran	_	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did wo	u gain nou	General insights,skil		m this sourse	0	0	0	4	2	9	7	2 06	1274/1	E76	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.86
		or make clear			0	0	0	2	5	6	9		1138/1		4.11	3.94	4.27	4.11	4.00
		stions reflect			0	6	0	0	3	8	5		925/1		3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13
	_	tions reflect		_	0	2	1	0	5	7	7		1103/1		3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.95
				what you learned	1	2	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	688/1		4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.21
				o what you learned	1	3	2	2	2	10	2	3.44	1239/1	434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.44
		system clearly			1	0	0	4	1	11	5	3.81	1219/1	547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.81
8. How ma:	ny times w	as class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1	574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	uld you gr	ade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	649/1	554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.13
		Lecture	e																
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lectures	s well	prepared	7	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	666/1	488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.67
2. Did th	e instruct	or seem intere	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1	493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.98
3. Was le	cture mate	rial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	366/1	486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.65
		contribute to		-	7 8	0	0	1	1	8	5		1042/1		3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.00
5. Did au	audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:					6	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	692/1	277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.90
	Discussion																		
	d class discussions contribute to what you learn				16	0	2	0	0	2			1129/1		3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.33
		_	_	d to participate	17	0	1	0	0	2	2		****/1		3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
				d open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	1	3		****/1		3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were s	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssful		17	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
		Laborat	_																
				f the material	2	0	0	1	3	6		4.25	129/		4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.25
_	_	_		ground information	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	- ,	240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.75
				or lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	6		4.70	83/		4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.70
		ructor provide			2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	68/		4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.70
5. Were r	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	64/	379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.60
		Field V			0.5				•	•			,				4 40	4 00	
				hat you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
_	_	_		uation criteria	21 21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	48 44	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
		or available fould you disc			21	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/	45	****	****	4.73 4.57	4.71 4.72	****
4. 10 WHa	t degree c	ould you disci	uss you	r evaluations	21	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	,	45			4.57	4.72	
	F						ribu	ıtior	1										
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5				Тур	pe			Majors			
00-27	3	A 10		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	 1	Grad	 uate	 e	0	 Majo	 r	2		
28-55							_			-							3 -		
56-83							neral	_				1	Unde	r-gr	rad 2	2	Non-	major	20
84-150																			
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0			Means t				h		
				P 0								_	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer				1	7							
	I 0 ? 1																		

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Baltimore County SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Page 301 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions						equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course		UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
					NA 												
1 544		General	- f b.i	0	0	1	1	_	_	0	2 05	1104/1576	2 04	2 04	4 20	1 11	2 05
			s from this course	0	0	1	1 0	5	5	9		1194/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.95
			the expected goals	0	-	-	-	4	6	11	4.33	851/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.33
			the expected goals	1	5	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	951/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.07
			the expected goals	0	3	1	1	6	3	7		1246/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.78
			e to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	708/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.20
			oute to what you learned		3	2	1	3	5			1123/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.71
		g system clearly	-	0	0	3	6	3	2	7		1424/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.19
	-	was class cancel		0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81		4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.81
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	924/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.88
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lectures	well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	666/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.50
2. Did th	he instruc	ctor seem interes	sted in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	683/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.71
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	720/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.35
4. Did th	he lecture	es contribute to	what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	1118/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.96
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enha	nce your understanding	1	6	3	2	2	1	6	3.36	1080/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.01
1 544		on	1.0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2 40	++++/1070	2 44	2 00	4 17	2 06	***	
		te to what you learned	16		2			-			****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****	
	all students actively encouraged to particip			16	0	1	0	0	0	4		****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
	he instructor encourage fair and open discuss			16 16	0	2	0	0	1	2		****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	
4. Were	re special techniques successful				2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
		Laborato	ory														
			ling of the material	5	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	155/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.06
2. Were	you provid	ded with adequate	e background information	. 5	0	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	135/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.31
3. Were n	necessary	materials availa	ble for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	107/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.63
4. Did th	he lab ins	structor provide	assistance	5	2	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	149/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.21
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab repor	ts clearly specified	2	2	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	142/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.29
		Seminar															
5. Were	criteria 1	for grading made	clear	12	0	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	279/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	3.11
			,														
1 5116		Field Wo		0.0	0	-	0	0	_	•	1 00	****	ate ate ate ate	at at at at	4 40	4 00	4.4.4.4.
	_		to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		,	****	****		4.20	****
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carry	out field activities	14	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self Pa	iced														
			e to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
5. Were t	there enou	ugh proctors for	all the students	15	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.33
		Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						Re:	asons				Туј	oe.			Majors	
00-27					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55					~		1				0	TTm c ²		11	3 7		1.0
56-83					Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	19
84-150											0			. 1			1-
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00			El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	n
			P 0		۵	1				_	1	response	es to k	oe sign	ııııcar	IT	
	I 0				Ot.	her				1	1						

0

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: BEDIAKO, BERNIC (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 302 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 21 Student Cot	ırse	вvат	uatı	on Q	uesti	LOIII	laire							
			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1194/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	851/1576		3.92	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	951/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	6	3	7	3.78	1246/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	708/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	3	5	6		1123/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	3	2	7		1424/1547		3.87	4.19	4.10	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	17		665/1574		4.76	4.64	4.59	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	6	3	3.75	1166/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	1048/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1150/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	973/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	0	3	6	3.92	1184/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1219/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	0	4		****/1270		3.91	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	0	1	2		****/1269			4.35	4.09	***
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878			4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	155/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	3	1	11	4.31		4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	,			4.51		4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	2	0	1	2	4	7	4.21				4.29	4.27	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	142/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.29
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	8	1	0	3 11	279/ 375	3 11	3 12	4 01	3 78	3 11
J. Weie Circuita for grading made crear	12	U	O	Ü	O	_	O	3.11	213/ 313	3.11	3.12	1.01	3.70	3.11
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52		****	4.48	4.20	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	3.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	Λ						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment:

SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

24 Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 303 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-		_	
				2	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment:

24 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 304 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouest	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level	Sect	
Quest		NK.	NA						Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Gen	eral														
1. Did you gain new insights,	skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	7	7	3.77	1337/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.77
2. Did the instructor make cl	ear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	10	4.18	1005/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions ref	lect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	850/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.24
4. Did other evaluations refl	ect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	953/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.16
5. Did assigned readings cont		1	1	0	3	3	7	7	3.90	989/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.90
6. Did written assignments co	ntribute to what you learned	1	5	0	4	2	6	4	3.63	1162/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	3.63
7. Was the grading system cle		1	0	3	1	3	6	8	3.71	1255/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.71
8. How many times was class c		1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.95
9. How would you grade the ov	erall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	5	7	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	3.77
Lec	ture														
1. Were the instructor's lect	ures well prepared	7	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	1187/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem in	terested in the subject	7	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	1240/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.62
3. Was lecture material prese	nted and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribut		8	0	3	0	0	3	8	3.93	1177/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques	enhance your understanding	7	9	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1200/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	2.92
Dis	cussion														
1. Did class discussions cont	ribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively		19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encoura	ge fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques su	ccessful	19	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
Lab	oratory														
1. Did the lab increase under	standing of the material	3	1	1	4	2	3	8	3.72	198/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	3.72
2. Were you provided with ade	quate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	58/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.74
3. Were necessary materials a		3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	164/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.37
4. Did the lab instructor pro	vide assistance	3	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	135/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.32
5. Were requirements for lab	reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	175/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.20
Fie	ld Work														
5. Did conferences help you c	arry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Sel	f Paced														
1. Did self-paced system cont		21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make c		21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with th	=	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring	_	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
	ere there enough proctors for all the students				0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****
					utio	n									
	-	-													
Credits Earned Cum.	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						S			Tv	ne			Majors	

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Baltimore County

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Baltimore County SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Instructor: SMIT Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 305 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	940/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	581/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	918/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	805/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	468/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	574/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	3	10	6	3.86	1174/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	892/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	957/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	658/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	821/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	13	4.22	983/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	692/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	126/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	165/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	194/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	62/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	118/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.36
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
										- 				
00-27 13 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 6		кес	quir	ea i	or M	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	5

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113 Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I SLADICK, KELLI (Instr. B) Spring 2009

> I 0

1

Instructor: Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 306 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								equer			_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questio	ns 		NR 	NA	1	2 	3	-4 	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	al															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk		om this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	940/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.26
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clea:	r the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	581/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.52
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions refle	ct the e	expected goals	0	8	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	918/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	805/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.30
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contril	bute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	468/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.43
		_		to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	574/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.35
		g system clear		ained	0	1	0	3	3	10	6	3.86	1174/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.86
		was class can			0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.74
9. How w	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	504/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.25
		Lectu	re															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectur	es well	prepared	6	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	907/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.45
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject s lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	734/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.85
3. Was 1						0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	437/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.55
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	672/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.37
5. Did a	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				6	9	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	309/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.25
		Discu																
				what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1279		3.80	4.17	3.96	****
				ed to participate	21	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
		Labora	_															
			_	of the material	1	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	126/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.27
				ground information	1	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	165/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.18
				for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	194/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.14
		structor provio			1	0	0	0 1	1 2	4 7	17 12	4.73	62/ 232 118/ 379	4.09 4.24	4.14	4.29	4.27 4.15	4.73
J. WCIC	ere requirements for lab reports clearly specifie					Ü	O	_	2	,	12	1.50	110/ 3/3	1.21	1,21	1.20	1.13	1.50
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	1									
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	son	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27)-27 13 0.00-0.99 0 A 13					Red	guir	ed fo	or M	 ajor	`====	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	 5
28-55										J						5 -		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	18
84-150													3				-	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons					
	P 0					0+1	h				- 1	0	-1		J-			

Other

19

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114 University of Maryland

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Ouestionnaires: 19

SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 307

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 1 1 1 8 8 4.11 1089/1576 3.84 3.94 4.30 4.11 4.11 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 8 11 4.58 515/1576 4.11 3.92 4.27 4.18 4.58 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 2 0 1 5 8 4.06 951/1342 3.93 3.86 4.32 4.19 4.06 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 7 10 4.50 511/1520 3.83 3.84 4.25 4.09 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 5 11 4.50 366/1465 4.09 3.90 4.12 4.02 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 3 6 8 4.29 636/1434 3.81 3.75 4.14 3.94 4.29 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 4 5 8 3.89 1152/1547 3.63 3.87 4.19 4.10 3.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 702/1574 4.74 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 8 4 4.33 623/1554 3.80 3.80 4.10 4.01 4.35 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 1 3 14 4.58 786/1488 4.25 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.70 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 18 4.95 334/1493 4.38 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 3 15 4.74 366/1486 4.16 4.04 4.32 4.26 4.77 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 5 13 4.63 539/1489 3.90 3.97 4.32 4.22 4.66 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 0 0 4 4 6 4.14 623/1277 3.43 3.72 4.03 3.91 4.24 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1279 3.44 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 17 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1270 3.44 3.91 4.35 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1269 3.45 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 4. Were special techniques successful 17 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 878 3.45 3.88 4.05 3.91 **** Laboratory 74/ 234 4.09 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.50 2. Were you provided with adequate background information $3 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 5 \quad 10 \quad 4.56$ 82/240 4.41 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 4 10 4.50 133/ 229 4.37 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.504. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 2 3 11 4.56 95/ 232 4.09 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.565. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 6 9 4.50 77/379 4.24 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.50 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 375 3.11 3.12 4.01 3.78 **** Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 326 3.00 3.45 4.03 3.64 **** Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Majors Reasons ______ 00-27 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 В 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 56-83 2 General 0 Under-grad 19 Non-major 17 84-150 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Ω F 0 Electives 0 Grad. 3.50-4.00 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 14

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: SLADICK, KELLI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 308 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		0	_		NID	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5		ructor	Course	_		Level	
		Questions	5 		NK	NA				-4 		Mean	Rank 	mean 	Mean	mean	mean	Mean
		General	l															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	1	1	1	8	8	4.11	1089/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.11
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	515/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.58
		uestions reflect			0	3	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	951/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.06
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	511/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.50
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contribu	ıte to w	hat you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	366/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.50
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	636/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.29
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	2	0	4	5	8	3.89	1152/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.89
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	702/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.79
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	584/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.35
		Lecture	<u>.</u>															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures		repared	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	385/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.70
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	4		4.76	888/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.86
				plained clearly	3	0	0	0	0			4.81			4.04		4.26	4.77
		es contribute to			3	0	0	1	0			4.69	474/1489	3.90		4.32	4.22	4.66
			_	ur understanding	5	5	0	1	1	1		4.33			3.72		3.91	
		Discus																
1 54	alaga diga			hat you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 E0	****/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
				to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1270	3.44	3.91		4.09	****
				l open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	_		****/1269	3.44	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
		echniques succes		open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1			****/ 878	3.45		4.05	3.91	****
i. Weie	SPECIAL C	comingues succes	JULUI		Ξ,	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	1.50	, 0,0	3.13	3.00	1.05	3.71	
		Laborat	-															
		crease understa			3	0	0	1	1	3	11		74/ 234			4.23	4.08	4.50
		_	_	round information	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	82/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.56
	_			r lab activities	3	0	0	0	2		10	4.50	133/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.50
		structor provide			3	0	0	0	2	3		4.56	95/ 232		4.14	4.29	4.27	4.56
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	77/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.50
		Semina	C															
5. Were	criteria	for grading made	e clear		18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
		Field V	Nork															
5. Did	conference	s help you carry		eld activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
				Frequ	enas	Diet	-rih	ıtior	2									
							CIID	20101	-									
Credits	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55																		
56-83							nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	major	17
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				- ^		0 + 1					- 1	4						

Other

14

I

0

1

· CHEM 102D 0113

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 309 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	4	4		1424/1576				4.11	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	929/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	0	3	1	4		1123/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	7		1225/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.09	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	6	5		1020/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	878/1434	3.81	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	4	3	3.31	1401/1547	3.63	3.87	4.19	4.10	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1165/1574	4.74	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	924/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	957/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	810/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	468/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	888/1489	3.90	3.97			4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	585/1277				3.91	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	U	1	U	5	4	4.20	505/12//	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1070/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	928/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	147/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	141/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57		4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	119/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 375	3.11	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	***	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
Oale Brand														
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.44	****
	14	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.83		****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15		0	1	0	0	0	2.50		****	****		4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1		0	-		****/ 382			4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Т2	0	U	Τ	0	U	0	2.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	* * * * *

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 309 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County BEURY, DAN (Instr. B) Spring 2009

Enrollment: 24

Title

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 310 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	2	_			2 56	1404/1556	2 04	2 04	4 20	4 11	2 56
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	4	4		1424/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0 5	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	929/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1 2	0 1	3	4	4 7		1123/1342	3.93	3.86	4.32	4.19	3.78 3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2 2	6	5		1225/1520 1020/1465	3.83 4.09	3.84 3.90	$4.25 \\ 4.12$	4.09 4.02	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	5		878/1434	3.81		4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	4	3		1401/1547	3.63	3.75	4.19	4.10	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7		1165/1574	4.74		4.64	4.59	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	2		849/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.06
J. now would fou grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	Ü	J	Ü	_	,	_	1.13	019/1331	3.00	3.00	1.10	1.01	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1192/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1489/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	3.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1101/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1118/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	889/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.97
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	3	2		1070/1270	3.44	3.91	4.17	4.09	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	928/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	3.45			3.91	
1. Wele special techniques successial		5	U	O	_	_		1.25	3077 070	3.13	3.00	1.05	3.71	1.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	147/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	141/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	119/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	119/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	5.00
Seminar	1 -	0	•	0	-	•	0	2 00	****	ate ate ate ate	F 00	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15 14	0	1	0 1	0	0	0		****/ 79 ****/ 72	****	5.00	4.69 4.64	4.52 4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.64	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 375	3.11	3.12		3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear		U	O	_	_	O	O	2.50	7 373	3.11	3.12	1.01	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.45	4.03	3.64	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: BEURY, DAN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 16

tr. B) Spring 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 310 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0116 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 311

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Enrollment: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 20

							Fre	ച	ncies	2		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	T.evel	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
1 Did	ou goin ne	Genera w insights,ski		om this source	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.47	682/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	1 11	1 17
		ew insignis,ski ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	1	3	11 14	4.47	267/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.47
		estions reflec			3	2	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	879/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	4.20
		ations reflect			3	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	511/1520	3.83	3.84	4.25	4.19	4.50
				what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	606/1465	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.03	4.29
				to what you learned	3	3	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	978/1434		3.75	4.14	3.94	3.93
		g system clearl			3	0	1	1	1	4	7		1006/1547	3.63	3.75	4.14	4.10	4.06
		was class cand		aineu	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574		4.76	4.19	4.10	5.00
				-6	11	0	0	0	0	1	8 T0							
9. HOW WO	ouia you g	grade the overa	ill tea	ching effectiveness	11	U	U	U	U	Τ	8	4.89	124/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.80
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	722/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.59
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	390/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.74
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	530/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.59
		es contribute t			4	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	552/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.54
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance	your understanding	5	5	2	0	3	0	5	3.60	974/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38
		Discus																
1 54 4	logg digg			what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	E10/1070	2 11	2 00	1 17	3.96	4.44
				ed to participate	11 10	0	0	0	0 3	2	6	4.10	510/1279 903/1270	3.44	3.80 3.91	4.17 4.35	4.09	4.10
				nd open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.10	928/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.00
		echniques succe		na open arscussion	11	4	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	603/878		3.88	4.05		3.80
4. Wele s	special te	eciniiques succe	ssiui		11	4	Т	U	U	2	۷	3.00	603/ 6/6	3.45	3.00	4.05	3.91	3.00
		Labora	itory															
				of the material	11	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00
				kground information	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	74/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.63
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable	for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	107/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.63
4. Did th	he lab ins	structor provid	le assi	stance	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	57/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.75
5. Were 1	requiremer	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	61/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.63
		Frequ	ency	r Dist	rib	ıt i oı	า											
									-									
Credits I	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Rec	mire	ed fo	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 4					10		-	-	or adda	-	-			-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	10	Non-	major	17
84-150	2	3 00-2.33	2	D 0		GCI	.c.a.	-				•	onaci -g.	Luu Z		14011	, O I	Τ,

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0116 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County (Instr. B) Spring 2009

Instructor: BEURY, DAN Enrollment: 20

Ouestionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 312 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 20 Student	COULDC	ш٧	, a i a	acic)II QC	LCDC.	10111	ulle							
				Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	N	ΝA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3		0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	682/1576	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3		0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	267/1576	4.11	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3		2	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	879/1342		3.86	4.32		4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3		1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	511/1520			4.25		4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned			0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	606/1465		3.90	4.12		4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn			3	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	,			4.14	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3		0	1	1	1	7	7		1006/1547		3.87	4.19		4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	4		0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574			4.64		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 12		1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	3.80	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.80
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9		0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	822/1488	4.25	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9		0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1176/1493	4.38	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9		0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	631/1486	4.16	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9		0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	754/1489	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	g 10		4	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1128/1277	3.43	3.72	4.03	3.91	3.38
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11		0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	510/1279	3.44	3.80	4.17	3.96	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10		0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	903/1270	3.44	3.91	4.35	4.09	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio	n 11		0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	928/1269	3.45	3.73	4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11		4	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	603/ 878	3.45	3.88	4.05	3.91	3.80
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11		0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	157/ 234	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background informati	on 12		0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	74/ 240	4.41	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activitie			0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	107/ 229	4.37	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12		0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	57/ 232	4.09	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12		0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	61/ 379	4.24	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.63
Fr	equency	γI	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	es				Rea	sons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	\$

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	Λ						

Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM

Instructor: OLSON, WENDY

Enrollment: 55
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 313 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General		•	•	•							4 40		4 00		4 40
		v insights, skills fro		0	0	0	0	4	16	20	4.40	787/1576		3.94		4.11	4.40
		or make clear the ex	_	0	0	0	1	9	21	9		1187/1576		3.92	4.27	4.18	3.95
	_	estions reflect the	_	0	0	0	0	11 5	13 13	16	4.13	925/1342		3.86	4.32	4.19	4.13
		ations reflect the ex		0	14 4	1	2	5 8	13	8 14	4.12	985/1520 891/1465				4.09	4.12
		adings contribute to Ignments contribute		0	17	0	2	8 6	11	9	3.97	941/1434		3.90 3.75	4.12	4.02 3.94	3.97 3.96
		system clearly expla		0	Τ,	0	0	8	15	9 17		871/1547		3.75	4.14	4.10	4.22
		was class cancelled	arned	0	1	0	0	0	31			1361/1574		4.76	4.19		4.22
	-	ade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	14	15			1299/1554		3.80		4.01	
9. HOW WO	uiu you gi	ade the Overall tead	ching effectiveness	9	U	U		14	13	_	3.34	1299/1334	3.32	3.00	4.10	4.01	3.32
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instruc	ctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	4	9	27	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.57
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	11	25	4.53	1193/1493	4.53	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.53
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presented and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	8	19	13	4.13	1054/1486	4.13	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.13
4. Did the	e lectures	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	1	5	14	20	4.32	899/1489	4.32	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.32
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	2	5	0	1	6	5	21	4.39	412/1277	4.39	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.39
		Discussion															
		ssions contribute to	_	32	0	0	0	2	4	2		****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
		s actively encourage		32	0	0	0	3	3	2		****/1270	***	3.91	4.35	4.09	****
		or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	3	4		****/1269		3.73	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques successful		32	5	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	3.91	****
		Laboratory															
5 Were r	eauirement	s for lab reports c	learly specified	34	0	0	0	0	1	5	4 83	****/ 379	****	4 24	4.20	4 15	****
3	O quil o morr	25 101 102 1040105 0	rearry preciries	5 -	Ū	Ü	Ü	Ü	_		1.05	, 3.15			1.20	1.15	
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made clear	r	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
	-	Field Work			•	•		_	•						4 00		
5. Did coi	nierences	help you carry out	field activities	38	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
			Frequ	encs	z Dist	trib	ut i c	m									
			11040	circ	DID	CI ID	ac_c	/11									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 8	λ 2								0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0	
28-55						quir	ea 1	or M	ajor	S	U	Graduat	е	U	мајс)Ľ	U
56-83						nera	1				0	Under-g	rad /	10	Non	-major	40
	34-150 5 3.00-3.49 13 D 0					ucra.	_				J	onder -g	rau 5		11011-	ila Jui	ΨU
	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 13 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0										-	respons				_	,
			I O		Ot.1	her				3	1	respond					
			? 0			-				_							

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20

TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A)

Job IRBR3029

Page 314 JUL 2, 2009

Ctudont	Courac	Evaluation	Ouggtionna	120
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronna	$_{1}$

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

			Fre	quer	cies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	952/1576	4.42	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	698/1576	4.57	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	12		583/1342	4.57	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	0	5		4.35	744/1520	4.40	3.84		4.09	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2		4.25	647/1465	4.36	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	6		4.39	544/1434	4.40	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	6	7		1182/1547	4.18	3.75	4.19	4.10	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6		4.70					4.10	4.70
	-	0	0	0	1	4			866/1574	4.80		4.64		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	U	U	Τ	4	ΤŢ	4.63	298/1554	4.39	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.31
Lecture			_		_									
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1		15	4.70	624/1488	4.78		4.47	4.41	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	810/1493	4.86	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	561/1486	4.50	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	13	4.20	997/1489	4.38	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	497/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	9	2	3.92	879/1279	3.92	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	1159/1270	3.38	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	3	4	3		1148/1269	3.38	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	1	0	2		2.83	833/ 878			4.05	3.91	
1. Here beceful econniques successivi	Ü	Ü	_	-	O	_	-	2.03	0337 070	2.03	3.00	1.05	3.71	2.05
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	55/ 234	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.63
9			-											
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	30/ 240	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	86/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	82/ 232	4.73		4.29	4.27	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	135/ 379	4.38	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.32
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
	19	0	0	0	0	1	0			****				****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	****/ 326		3.45	4.03	3.64	
October 19 maria														
Self Paced	1.0	•	_	•	0	_	_	4 00		44		4		4.4.1.
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	1.00		****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	3.86	****

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Title Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 314 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-			
				?	0						

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 315 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	952/1576	4.42	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.25
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	698/1576	4.57	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.45
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6		4.50	583/1342	4.57	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.50
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	0	5		4.35	744/1520	4.40	3.84		4.09	4.35
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2		4.25	647/1465	4.36		4.12	4.02	4.25
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	6		4.39	544/1434	4.40	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.39
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	6			1182/1547	4.18	3.87		4.10	3.85
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6		4.70	866/1574	4.80	4.76	4.19	4.59	4.70
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	1	7		4.00	924/1554	4.39	3.80	4.10		4.31
9.	now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	/	Т	U	Т	Т	,	3	4.00	924/1334	4.39	3.00	4.10	4.01	4.31
	Tashuus														
-	Lecture	-	0	•	_	-	2		4 60	666 (1.400	4 50	4 0 4	4 45	4 41	4 60
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	11		666/1488	4.78	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.68
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	810/1493	4.86	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.80
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	8	4		1081/1486	4.50		4.32	4.26	4.33
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	2			1169/1489	4.38	3.97		4.22	4.07
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	818/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.08
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	9	2	3.92	879/1279	3.92	3.80	4.17	3.96	3.92
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	1159/1270	3.38	3.91	4.35	4.09	3.38
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1148/1269	3.38	3.73	4.35	4.09	3.38
4.	Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	833/ 878	2.83	3.88	4.05	3.91	2.83
	•														
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	55/ 234	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.63
	Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	30/ 240	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.89
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	6		4.68	86/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.68
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5		4.63	82/ 232	4.73		4.29	4.27	4.63
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	135/ 379	4.38	4.24			4.32
٥.	were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	U	U		2	O	10	4.34	133/ 3/3	4.30	4.24	4.20	4.13	4.34
	Seminar														
1		18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4 70	4 50	****
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme			•	-	-	_	_		,	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,			4.69	4.52	
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.78	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	3.64	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 382	****	3.24	4.78	3.86	****
٥.	mere energy proceers for all the scudents	Τ0	U	J	U	J	т		Ŧ.50	/ 302		J.44	T.00	5.00	

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Title Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 315 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

Page 316

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Centeral Did you gain new insight, akills from this course 0			Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ranl	ĸ	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			General																
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 8 8 14 .46 443/1342 4.57 3.86 4.32 4.19 4.64 1.01 dots reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 1 9 10 4.45 614/1520 4.04 0.84 4.12 6.19 4.95 1.01 billion sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 3 5 13 4.48 410/1465 4.36 3.90 4.12 4.02 4.48 1.01 billion sasigness contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 1 4.45 1.01 billion sasigness contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 12 4.50 537/1547 4.13 3.87 4.19 4.10 4.50 1.00 billion sasigness contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 12 4.50 537/1547 4.13 3.87 4.19 4.10 4.50 1.00 billion sasigness cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 12 4.50 537/1547 4.13 3.87 4.19 4.10 4.50 1.00 billion sasigness cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 12 4.50 537/1547 4.13 3.87 4.19 4.10 4.50 1.00 billion sasigness cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 12 4.50 537/1547 4.13 3.87 4.19 4.10 4.50 1.00 billion sasigness cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 535/1554 4.39 3.80 4.10 4.50 1.00 4.50 billion sasigness cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 535/1554 4.39 3.80 4.10 4.50 1.00 4.50 billion sasigness cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	513/1	576	4.42	3.94	4.30	4.11	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	364/1	576	4.57	3.92	4.27	4.18	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 3 5 13 4.48 410/1465 4.36 3.90 4.12 4.02 4.48 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 3 0 1 1 5 10 4.50 52/1547 4.18 3.07 4.19 4.10 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 12 4.50 52/1547 4.18 3.07 4.19 4.10 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 19 4.50 52/1554 4.18 3.07 4.19 4.10 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 52/1554 4.18 3.07 4.19 4.10 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.18 3.07 4.19 4.10 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.18 3.08 4.10 4.01 4.45 1.00 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.01 4.45 1.00 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.10 4.50 8.10 1.00 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.10 4.50 8.10 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.10 4.50 8.10 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.10 4.50 8.10 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.10 4.50 8.10 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.10 4.50 8.10 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.10 4.50 8.10 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 3.08 4.10 4.10 4.50 8.10 1.00 1 1 4.55 52/1554 4.10 8.10 1.00 1 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10	3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	443/13	342	4.57	3.86	4.32	4.19	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 11 4.95 157/11494 4.18 3.87 4.19 4.10 4.99 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 19 4.90 4.90 14.55 157/11494 4.80 4.76 4.64 4.89 4.90 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 19 4.90 4.95 155/1154 4.80 4.76 4.64 4.89 4.90 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.55 155/1154 4.80 4.76 4.64 4.89 4.90 1. Which would you grade the overall prepared 8. 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.55 155/11494 4.80 4.76 4.64 4.89 4.90 1. Which would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.95 124/1488 4.78 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.87 4.81 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80 1	4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	614/1	520	4.40	3.84	4.25	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 9 12 4.50 52/11647 4.18 3.87 4.19 4.10 4.50 8.100 MB. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 19 4.50 52/11647 4.80 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.99 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.55 355/1554 4.30 3.80 4.10 4.01 4.46 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 21 4.55 355/1554 4.30 3.80 4.10 4.01 4.46 1.200 MB. Analysis of the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 20 4.91 55/1493 4.86 4.34 4.73 4.65 4.93 3.80 4.10 4.01 4.86 4.05 4.04 4.07 4.41 4.87 4.80 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.0	5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	410/1	465	4.36	3.90	4.12	4.02	4.48
8. Now many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness of 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 19 4.90 469/1574 4.80 4.76 4.64 4.59 4.90 4.90 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness of 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.95 155/1554 4.39 3.80 4.10 4.01 4.46 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.95 124/1488 4.78 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.87 7.2 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contribute t	o what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	511/1	434	4.40	3.75	4.14	3.94	4.41
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 9 11 4.55 355/1554 4.39 3.80 4.10 4.01 4.46	7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	527/1	547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.10	4.50
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0	8. How mar	ny times	was class cancelled						0	2	19	4.90	469/1	574	4.80	4.76	4.64	4.59	4.90
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 21 4.95 124/1488 4.78 4.24 4.47 4.41 4.87 2.01 dthe instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 0 4.91 557/1493 4.86 4.93 4.73 4.65 4.93 3.84 lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 5 17 4.77 311/1486 4.50 4.04 4.32 4.26 4.68 4.01 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 4 1 4 6 10 4.19 585/1277 4.04 3.72 4.03 3.91 4.00 Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Laboratory Discussion Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** Laboratory Discussion Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.91 4.35 4.09 **** Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.83 32/ 240 4.89 4.38 4.35 4.09 **** Lever you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.33 4.25 4.25 4.80 4.01 dthe lab instructor provide assistance New renecessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.31 4.45 4.50 4.45 4.50 dthe distribution provide with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.31 4.45 4.50 dthe distribution provide with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.31 4.45 4.50 dthe distribution provide available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ***/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** Definition of the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9. How wor	uld you	grade the overall tead	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	355/1	554	4.39	3.80	4.10	4.01	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 20 4.91 557/1493 4.86 4.43 4.73 4.65 4.93 3.84 lecture material presented and explained clearly o 0 0 0 0 5 1 7.47 511/1486 4.50 4.04 4.32 4.26 4.68 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 17 4.68 474/1489 4.38 3.97 4.32 4.22 4.70 5.01 diadiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 4 17 4.68 474/1489 4.38 3.97 4.32 4.22 4.70 5.01 diadiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 2.89 4.10 51.01 the lab students actively encouraged to participate 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 2.89 4.19 4.19 51.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 3.00 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.79 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.79 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.79 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.79 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.79 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.79 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.79 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.70 4.22 4.23			Lecture																
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 5 17 4.77 311/1486 4.50 4.04 4.32 4.26 4.68 4.06 the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 4 17 4.68 4.77 44/1489 4.38 3.97 4.32 4.22 4.70 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 1 4 6 10 4.19 585/1277 4.04 3.72 4.03 3.91 4.00 Discussion Contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.50 ****/1270 3.38 3.91 4.35 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.50 ****/1270 3.38 3.71 4.35 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.50 ****/1270 3.38 3.71 4.35 4.09 **** 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 13 4.76 33/234 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 4.70 4.10 ****/1269 3.78 5.00 4.72 4.88 3.74 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.70 4.24 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.2	1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	124/1	488	4.78	4.24	4.47	4.41	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 17 4.68 474/1489 4.38 3.97 4.32 4.22 4.70 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 1 4 6 10 4.19 585/1277 4.04 3.72 4.03 3.91 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1279 3.98 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1279 3.98 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.88 32/240 4.89 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.88 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117/229 4.64 4.99 4.51 4.33 4.59 4.59 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50	2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem interested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1	493	4.86	4.43	4.73	4.65	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 1 4 6 10 4.19 585/1277 4.04 3.72 4.03 3.91 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.98 3.81 4.15 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.98 3.81 4.15 4.09 **** 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.91 4.35 4.09 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 0 4 13 4.76 33/ 234 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 32/ 240 4.89 4.18 4.35 4.29 4.88 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.29 4.88 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 96/ 379 4.38 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.44 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.74 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field work 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Paper Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Major 0 Graduate 0 Major 0	3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	311/1	486	4.50	4.04	4.32	4.26	4.68
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1279 3.92 3.80 4.17 3.96 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.91 4.35 4.09 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.88 32/ 240 4.89 4.38 4.25 4.29 4.88 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.59 4.94 Lid the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 46/ 232 4.73 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.82 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 96/ 379 4.38 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.44 5.54 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.74 4.52 **** 2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** **Frequency Distribution** **Frequency Distribution	4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	474/1	489	4.38	3.97	4.32	4.22	4.70
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	1	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	585/1	277	4.04	3.72	4.03	3.91	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1270 3.38 3.91 4.35 4.09 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/1269 3.38 3.73 4.35 4.09 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 4 13 4.76 33/234 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.99 11.729 4.64 4.99 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.88 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.99 11.729 4.64 4.99 4.31 4.92 4.27 4.82 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.99 11.729 4.64 4.99 4.18 4.91 4.89 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.99 11.729 4.64 4.99 4.18 4.92 4.77 4.82 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 96/379 4.38 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.44 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors One 27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-grad 22 Non-major 25 8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Under-g			Discussion																
Laboratory Labora	1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1	279	3.92	3.80	4.17	3.96	****
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 4 13 4.76 33/234 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 32/240 4.89 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.88 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.89 117/229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.59 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 46/232 4.73 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.82 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 96/379 4.38 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.44 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 4.11 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 88-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	2. Were al	ll studer	d to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1	270	3.38	3.91	4.35	4.09	****	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 4 13 4.76 33/ 234 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.76 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 32/ 240 4.89 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.88 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.55 117/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.59 4.70 4.22 4.23 4.08 4.38 4.36 4.29 4.88 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.55 117/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.59 4.74 4.82 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 46/ 232 4.73 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.82 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 4.48 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 4.40 4.11 **** ****************************	3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage fair ar	d open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1	269	3.38	3.73	4.35	4.09	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 32/240 4.89 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.88 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117/229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.59 4.88 4.01 the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 46/232 4.73 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.82 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 96/379 4.38 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.44 Seminar Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Self Paced Did solf-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 *** *** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced Did solf-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** *** 4.60 4.44 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Oncolor 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Gradual 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Major 0 Electives 0 Washington of the proposes to be significant of the provided for the proposes to be significant of the proposes to be significant of the proposes to be significant of the provided for the propose of the proposes to be significant of the propose of the proposes to be significant of the propose of the proposes to be significant of the propose o			Laboratory																
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117 / 229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.59 5.00 the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 46/ 232 4.73 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.82 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 96/ 379 4.38 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.44 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors One of the pack of	1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understanding o	of the material	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	33/ 3	234	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.08	4.76
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 1 5 11 4.59 117 / 229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.43 4.59 5.00 the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 46/ 232 4.73 4.14 4.29 4.27 4.82 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 96/ 379 4.38 4.24 4.20 4.15 4.44 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors One of the pack of	2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequate back	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	32/	240	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.88
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 10					5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	117/	229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.43	4.59
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.69 4.52 **** 4.60 4.64 4.43 **** 4.60 4.64 4.43 **** 4.60 4.64 4.43 **** 4.60 4.64 4.43 **** 4.60 4.64 4.41 **** 4.60 4.64 4.61 **** 4.60 4.64 4.61 **** 4.60 4.64 4.65	4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provide assis	tance	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	46/	232	4.73	4.14	4.29	4.27	4.82
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab reports cl	early specified	5	1	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	96/	379	4.38	4.24	4.20	4.15	4.44
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Seminar																
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.43 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Graduate 0 ### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1. Were as	ssigned t	topics relevant to the	announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	85	****	5.00	4.72	4.52	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Gradu. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	2. Was the	e instru	ctor available for ind	lividual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.48 4.20 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Gradu. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	3. Did res	search p	rojects contribute to	what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 4.11 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Gradu. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Field Work																
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1. Did fie	eld expe	rience contribute to w	hat you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 40 **** **** 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	2. Did you	u clearly	y understand your eval	uation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors			Self Paced																
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							-								****	****			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	2. Dia sti	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal					U	U	Ü	1	U	4.00	****/	24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
28-55	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	3
28-55	00-27	 9	0.00-0.99 0	 A 9		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	0	 Gradı	uate	 e	0	Maic	 or	0
56-83											-) -		-
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0					nera	1				0	Unde	r-gi	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	22
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant														_				-	
P 0 responses to be significant							ecti	ves				0	####	- N	Means t	here a	are not	enous	_j h
																		_	
				I 0		Other				2	1	_							

? 0

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Title Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Page 317 JUL 2, 2009 Baltimore County Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

O +	a	The second second second	0
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	-		_	

? 0

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101
Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Baltimore Cour

Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 19

s: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 318
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1089/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	5		1076/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2		8		865/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1041/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1095/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1178/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	971/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	9	2	3.86	1096/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	263/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32		4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	614/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	645/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	Λ	3 00	****/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/1270		3.91	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	0	0			****/ 878			4.05	4.09	****
1. Were special techniques successivi	10	_	_	O	O	O	U	1.00	, 0,10		3.00	1.05	1.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	74/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	62/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	44/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	42/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	99/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.43

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Title Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 319 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101 University of Maryland Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Baltimore County

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Baltimore County KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. C) Spring 2009

I

?

1

Instructor: KLUTSE,
Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 320 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	l vou gain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	<i>A</i> 11	1089/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	12	5		1076/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.11
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	8	8		865/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.21
		ations reflect			0	12	0	0	1	5			1041/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.00
				what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	7			1095/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.76
				o what you learned	0	7	2	1	1	4	4		1178/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.58
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	2	2	7	8		971/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.11
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
				hing effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1227/1554		3.80	4.10	4.09	3.84
		Lectur	e															
1. Wer	re the instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.70
2. Dic	d the instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.79
				explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.25
4. Dic	d the lecture	s contribute to	o what	you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.38
5. Did	d audiovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	15	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.12
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	d class discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	****
2. Wer	re all studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	****
3. Dic	d the instruc	tor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	***
4. Wer	re special te	chniques succe	ssful		16	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	***
		Labora	tory															
		rease understa			5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	74/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
				ground information	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	62/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.71
				for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	44/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.86
		structor provide			5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	42/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.86
5. Wer	re requiremen	its for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	99/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.43
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 7 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А б				ed fo	 วะ M:	 aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		4
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1,00	1411	-u 1	J_ 1*10	۱۰۲ م		0	Graduat	_	J	1.100)		1
56-83		2.00-2.99	2	C 7		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	9	Non-	-major	15
84-15		3.00-3.49	5	D 0		001	icia.	-				0	onaci -g.	Luu I		14011		13
Grad.		3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
or ad.		3.30 1.30	-	P 0								-	respons				_	

Other

18

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102 Universititle ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Balt

FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)

Instructor: FABRENTO Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 321
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

					_					_		a			- 1	a .
	0		NTD	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
	Questions		NK	NA		2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	mean	Mean	mean	Mean	mean
	General															
1. Did you gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1081/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11
2. Did the instruc	tor make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam qu	estions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evalu	ations reflect the e	xpected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1212/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned re	adings contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	647/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.25
6. Did written ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	838/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.25
8. How many times	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1081/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.08
	Lecture															
1. Were the instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.82
	ctor seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.61
3. Was lecture mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	891/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.17
	es contribute to what	-	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	766/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.22
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25
	Discussion															
1. Did class discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.40
	its actively encourage		4	0	0	1	1	2	1		1116/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.60
	ctor encourage fair a		4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00
	chniques successful		4	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 878	***	3.88	4.05	4.09	***
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab inc	rease understanding	of the material	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	125/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.29
	led with adequate bac		2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	115/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.43
	materials available	_	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	119/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57
	structor provide assi		2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	5.00
	its for lab reports c		2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.71
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
		_														
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Title Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 322 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1081/1576	4.11	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1212/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	647/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1434	4.09	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	838/1547	4.18	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	571/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	1		1321/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	1		1101/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1		1118/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/1277	4.18	3.72		4.11	
Discussion				•	_	_	_						4 00	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	Ι	0	1	2	Τ		1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	Τ	2	1		1116/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	Τ	0	2	2	4.00		4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	125/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	115/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	119/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.71
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2 2 2	0 0	0 0	0	0 1 1 0	2 2 1 0 2	5 7	4.43 4.57 5.00	115/ 240 119/ 229 1/ 232	4.57 4.71 4.93	4.38 4.49 4.14	4.35 4.51 4.29	4.32 4.48 4.16	4.43 4.57 5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: MANNING, STEVEN (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 323 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								T		G	D t-	TIME	T 1	Q
Ouestions	NR	NA	fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	4		1081/1576		3.94	4.30	4.30	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.39	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2		1212/1520	3.92	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	647/1465	4.01	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1434		3.75	4.14	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	838/1547		3.87	4.19	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574		4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1554	3.96	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	4.76	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1493	4.70	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	4.21	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1489	4.30	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	4.18	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	125/ 234	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	115/ 240	4.57	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	119/ 229	4.71	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 232	4.93	4.14	4.29	4.16	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.71
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CHEM 302 0101 University of Maryland PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II

Page 324 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	3	2	3	2.75	1558/1576	2.75	3.94	4.30	4.30	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	4	2	3	2.93	1538/1576	2.93	3.92	4.27	4.28	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	3	3	3.06	1289/1342	3.06	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1339/1520	3.57	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	0	2	2	3	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	777/1434	4.17	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	7	2	2	2	2	2.33	1527/1547	2.33	3.87	4.19	4.21	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1165/1574	4.44	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	5	3	5	2	0	2.27	1541/1554	2.27	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	4	4	3	3.19	1435/1488	3.19	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	4	3	3	2	2.69	1459/1486	2.69	4.04	4.32	4.32	2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	1	4	1	3	2.50	1466/1489	2.50	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	****	3.72	4.03	4.11	***

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				2	3						

Title

Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 16 Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101 University of Maryland PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Title Instructor: GOLDBERG, ROBER (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 74 Questionnaires: 30

Page 325 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

		Ouestion	q		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			1	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	,		3.94	4.30	4.30	4.31
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	2	4	14	9		1119/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	4.03
	_	estions reflec		1 3	1	0	0	1	3	11	14	4.31	788/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	4.31
		ations reflect			2	10	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	985/1520		3.84	4.25	4.25	4.11
				what you learned	1	1	1	3	8	3	13		1028/1465		3.90	4.12	4.09	3.86
		_		o what you learned	1	9	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	-,		3.75	4.14	4.15	4.20
		g system clearl		ined	2	0	1	4	2	6	15		992/1547		3.87	4.19		
		was class canc			2	1	0	0	0	5			645/1574			4.64	4.61	
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	11	9	4	3.71	1201/1554	3.81	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.81
		Lectur	е															
		actor's lecture			2	0	2	0	1	4	21	4.50	870/1488	4.63	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.63
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	1077/1493	4.71	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.71
		-		xplained clearly	2	0	1	3	9	7	8		1293/1486			4.32		4.02
		es contribute t		-	2	2	2	3	2	6			1147/1489		3.97			4.25
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	4	2	1	1	9	11	4.08	660/1277	4.04	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.04
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	413/1279	4.56	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.56
				d to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	574/1270		3.91	4.35	4.42	4.59
				d open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	0	15	4.56	614/1269	4.56	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.56
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	ssful		12	11	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Labora	tory															
5. Were	requiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.17	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	4.23	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Farned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pο	ason	c			Ту	ne			Majors	
													ту.					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8		~		,				0	TT			37		20
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	29	Non-	-major	28
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 1								2	шшли	M	. la aur			.lo
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0 P 0		E⊥€	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1					111
				P 0		0+1					_		respons	es to E	e sign	ııııcar	1L	

Other

20

I 0

1

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101 University of Maryland Title PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 326

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 74 Questionnaires: 30

KELLY, LISA

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Overtions						Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	1	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	882/1576	4.31	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.31
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	1	0	0	2	4	14	9	4.03	1119/1576	4.03	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.03
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	3	11	14	4.31	788/1342	4.31	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.31
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	10	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	985/1520	4.11	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.11
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	1	1	1	3	8	3	13	3.86	1028/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.86
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	9	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	748/1434	4.20	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.20
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	z explai	.ned	2	0	1	4	2	6	15	4.07	992/1547	4.07	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.07
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	1	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.81
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	13	4	3.91	1060/1554	3.81	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.81
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures		repared	2	0	0	1	1	2	24	4.75	505/1488	4.63	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.63
		tor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	849/1493		4.43	4.73	4.70	4.71
	ecture material presented and explained clea che lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	0	2	3	5	18	4.39	831/1486		4.04	4.32	4.32	4.02
		-			4	0	0	1	0	9	16	4.54	660/1489		3.97	4.32		4.25
	audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				2	5	3	0	3	5	12	4.00	692/1277		3.72	4.03	4.11	4.04
J. 214 440					_	J	5	Ü	J	J		1.00	0,2,22,,		3.72	1.05		
!	Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you learne					•			_				440 /4000				4 00	
					12	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	413/1279		3.80	4.17	4.20	4.56
				to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	574/1270		3.91	4.35	4.42	4.59
				l open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	0	15	4.56	614/1269		3.73	4.35	4.41	4.56
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		12	11	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.17	****
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry	out fi	eld activities	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	4.23	****
	E					7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
a 1'. =	ita Farnad Cum CDA Farnastad Crea							_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s 			Ту 	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Gei	neral	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	29	Non-	major	28
84-150																		
Grad.	1. 1 3.50-4.00 6 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	. enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ιt	
				I 0		Otl	her				2	0						
				? 1														

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102 University of Maryland JUL 2, 2009 Title

ADVANCED LAB II Baltimore County Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Enrollment: 10

Ouestionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 327

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1576 5.00 3.94 4.30 4.30 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 448/1576 4.63 3.92 4.27 4.28 4.63 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 583/1342 4.50 3.86 4.32 4.30 4.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 719/1520 4.38 3.84 4.25 4.25 4.38 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 850/1465 4.00 3.90 4.12 4.09 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 398/1434 4.50 3.75 4.14 4.15 4.507. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 387/1547 4.63 3.87 4.19 4.21 4.63 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.76 4.64 4.61 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 146/1554 4.00 3.80 4.10 4.09 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 324/1488 4.20 4.24 4.47 4.47 4.20 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 7 \quad 5.00$ 1/1493 4.14 4.43 4.73 4.70 4.14 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 596/1486 4.00 4.04 4.32 4.32 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 434/1489 3.68 3.97 4.32 4.34 3.68 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 1149/1277 3.00 3.72 4.03 4.11 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 00 0 0 2 5.00 1/1279 5.00 3.80 4.17 4.20 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1270 5.00 3.91 4.35 4.42 5.00 1/1269 5.00 3.73 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 600025.00 1/878 5.00 3.88 4.05 4.09 5.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 42/ 234 4.71 4.22 4.23 4.24 4.71 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 36/240 4.86 4.38 4.35 4.32 4.86 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities $1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 6 \ 4.71 \ 77/ \ 229 \ 4.71 \ 4.49 \ 4.51 \ 4.48 \ 4.71$ 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 1 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 75/232 4.67 4.14 4.29 4.16 4.67 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 67/379 4.57 4.24 4.20 4.17 4.57 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.67 **** 0 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.53 **** 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 80 **** 4.61 4.22 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 7 1.00-1.99 0 в 3 28-55 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 8 Non-major 1 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 F 0 Electives Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant Ι 0 Other ?

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED LAB II

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 328

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 8

OLESKE, JEFFREY (Instr. B)

Instructor:

		Questions	3		NI	3	NA	Fre 1	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sec:
		 General																	
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	()	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.0
		tor make clear)	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	4.6
		estions reflect)	6	0	0	0	1	1		583/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	4.5
	_	ations reflect	_	_	()	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	719/1520			4.25	4.25	4.3
		adings contribu			d ()	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.0
. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you lear	ned ()	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.5
. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explair	ned -	()	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	387/1547	4.63	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.6
. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		()	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.0
). How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teachi	ing effectiven	ess 2	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1303/1554	4.00	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.0
		Lecture	2																
. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	well pr	repared	4	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1353/1488	4.20	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.2
. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subject	4	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1454/1493	4.14	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.1
. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and exp	plained clearl	У 4	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1253/1486	4.00	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.0
		es contribute to				4	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1415/1489	3.68	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.6
. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	ır understandi	ng 4	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	3.00	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.0
		Discuss	sion																
		nat you learne		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.20	5.0		
. Were al	ere all students actively encouraged to participa				е 6	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.42	5.0
	id the instructor encourage fair and open discussi					5	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.41	
. Were sp	Were special techniques successful					5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.09	5.0
		Laborat	_																
		rease understar				1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 234		4.22	4.23	4.24	4.7
_	_	led with adequat	_			1	0	0	0	0	1		4.86	36/ 240			4.35	4.32	
	_	materials avail				1	0	0	0	1	0		4.71	77/ 229		4.49	4.51	4.48	
		structor provide				1 1	1	0	0	1	0 3	5	4.67	75/ 232		4.14		4.16	
. were re	equiremer	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	-	L	U	0	0	Ü	3	4	4.57	67/ 379	4.57	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.5
T-T		Seminar				7	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	1 67	***
	_	copics relevant ctor available f				<i>1</i> 7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.72	4.67 4.69	***
		cojects contribu				7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	***
		ons contribute t				7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80		****	4.61	4.22	***
_		for grading made	_	ou learned		7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 375		3.12		4.12	***
		3 3			requenc	77.7	Diat	rib	1+10	2									
	endita Formed Cum CDA Exposted Co							- T T D (
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	des 				Rea	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 3 B 3			Req	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55							_		,				0		,	0			_
56-83							Gen	iera.	T				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	1
04 1 5 0								1					0			1			.1-
	^																		าก
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2				ETE	ectiv	ves				U	#### -				_	,
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0 I 0			Oth		ves				8	respons				_	,

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED LAB II

Baltimore County ZHANG, YU (Instr. C) Spring 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 10

Ouestionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 329 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1576 5.00 3.94 4.30 4.30 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 448/1576 4.63 3.92 4.27 4.28 4.63 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 583/1342 4.50 3.86 4.32 4.30 4.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 719/1520 4.38 3.84 4.25 4.25 4.38 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 850/1465 4.00 3.90 4.12 4.09 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 398/1434 4.50 3.75 4.14 4.15 4.507. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 387/1547 4.63 3.87 4.19 4.21 4.63 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.76 4.64 4.61 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 4 0 3.67 1227/1554 4.00 3.80 4.10 4.09 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1233/1488 4.20 4.24 4.47 4.47 4.20 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1462/1493 4.14 4.43 4.73 4.70 4.14 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1286/1486 4.00 4.04 4.32 4.32 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 1363/1489 3.68 3.97 4.32 4.34 3.68 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 2 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1277 3.00 3.72 4.03 4.11 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 00 0 0 2 5.00 1/1279 5.00 3.80 4.17 4.20 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1270 5.00 3.91 4.35 4.42 5.00 1/1269 5.00 3.73 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 600025.00 1/878 5.00 3.88 4.05 4.09 5.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 42/ 234 4.71 4.22 4.23 4.24 4.71 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 36/240 4.86 4.38 4.35 4.32 4.86 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities $1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 6 \ 4.71 \ 77/ \ 229 \ 4.71 \ 4.49 \ 4.51 \ 4.48 \ 4.71$ 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 1 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 75/232 4.67 4.14 4.29 4.16 4.67 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 67/379 4.57 4.24 4.20 4.17 4.57 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.67 **** 0 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.53 **** 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 80 **** 4.61 4.22 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Majors Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 7 1.00-1.99 0 в 3 28-55 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 8 Non-major 1 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 F 0 Electives Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant Ι 0 Other

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA

Enrollment: 242 Questionnaires: 131

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 330 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	16	32	79	4.48	682/1576	4.48	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	10	21	97	4.66	406/1576	4.66	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	3	9	29	86	4.56	531/1342	4.56	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	57	0	4	11	18	34	4.22	891/1520	4.22	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	13	1	6	9	25	71	4.42	498/1465	4.42	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	78	1	3	11	10	23	4.06	852/1434	4.06	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.06
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	5	0	0	2	13	32	79	4.49	543/1547	4.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0		107	4.85	586/1574		4.76	4.64	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	2	0	0	5	41	57	4.50	395/1554	4.50	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	19	105	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	8	116	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2		100	4.76	325/1486	4.76	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	6		100	4.72	420/1489	4.72	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	25	4	3	18	27	42	4.06	668/1277	4.06	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	103	0	2	0	8	5	13		****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	102	0	2	0	11	2	14	3.90	****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	99	0	3	2	4	5	18		****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	100	24	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	121	2	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	123	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 229	****	4.49	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	122	1	1	0	0	3	4		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	119	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	125	3	0	0	0	2	1	1.55	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	126	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	127	3	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	126	2	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	127	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	127	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.20	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	128	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	128	1	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	129	1	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	127	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	126	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	128	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	127	0	0	1	0	0	3	1.25	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	127	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	128	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 382	***	3.24	4.08	4.24	****

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA

Enrollment: 242 Questionnaires: 131 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 330 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 331

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

Instructor:

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1 Did v	vou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	Ο	Ο	0	8	6	4.43	757/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.43
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36		4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.36
		uestions reflec			2	5	0	0	1	5	3		857/1342			4.32	4.30	4.22
	_	uations reflect			2	2	0	2	1	6	3		1212/1520		3.84		4.25	3.83
				what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	6	5		748/1465		3.90		4.09	4.15
	_	_		to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	7	3		1087/1434			4.14		3.77
		g system clearl			3	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	, -	4.20	3.73		4.13	4.08
		was class cand		illea	3	0	0	0	0	7	_		1128/1574		4.76	4.19	4.61	
				hina offertiness	3	1	0	0	0	8								
9. HOW W	would you	grade the overa	ill tead	thing effectiveness	3	1	U	U	U	8	4	4.33	623/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.29
		Lectur	re															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	589/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.54
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	3	10		1077/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.64			4.04	4.32	4.32	4.61
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	0	0	1	5		4.50		4.21			4.34	
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				2	2	0	1	0	6	-		533/1277				4.11	
		Discus					_		_									
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2		4.20	712/1279	3.96		4.17	4.20	4.20
				ed to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2		4.20			3.91	4.35	4.42	
				nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3		4.00	928/1269	3.77		4.35		4.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	essful		11	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.25
		Labora	torv															
1 Did +	the lah in	crease understa	_	of the material	6	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	74/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
				ground information	6	0	0	1	1	3		4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.20
				for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2		4.40		4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.40
		structor provid			6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	49/ 232	4.46		4.29	4.16	4.80
					6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	105/ 379				4.17	
o. were	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified				0	U	U	U	۷	2	0	4.40	105/ 3/9	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.1/	4.40
	F						trib	utio	n									
Credits	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	`S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
	_		_									_						

Electives

Other

1

14

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101 University of Mar Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore Cour

TOMNEY, MATTHEW (Instr. B)

Instructor:

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 332

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

									_	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	ls fro	om this cour	se	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	757/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.43
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goal	S	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	825/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.3
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goa	ls	2	5	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	857/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.2
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goal	S	2	2	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1212/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.8
		eadings contribu				2	1	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	748/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.1
5. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contri	.bute t	to what you	learned	3	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1087/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.7
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearly	expla	ained		3	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	992/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.0
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1128/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.4
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l tead	ching effect	iveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	712/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.2
		Lecture	2																
l. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared		5	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	1025/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.5
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem intere	sted i	in the subje	ct	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1142/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.6
. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented	l and e	explained cl	early	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	584/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.6
l. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	500/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.5
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir					4	4	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	309/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.3
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you le	arned	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	712/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.2
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to partic	ipate	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.2
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage f	air ar	nd open disc	ussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	928/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.0
1. Were s	special to	echniques succes	sful			11	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	4.2
		Laborat	ory																
l. Did th	he lab in	crease understan	nding o	of the mater	ial	6	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	74/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.5
. Were y	you provi	ded with adequat	e back	kground info	rmation	6	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.2
. Were r	necessary	materials avail	able f	for lab acti	vities	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	154/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.4
l. Did th	he lab in	structor provide	assis	stance		6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	49/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.8
5. Were r	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	105/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.4
					Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits I	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	3
 00-27								 miir		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6		neo	darre	EU I	JI Md	ניייני	>	U	Graduati	-	U	ria JC) <u>T</u>	U
		1.UU 1.JJ	0																

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 333

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Instructor: WAUCHOPE, ORRET (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 334

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	aain n	Genera w insights,ski		m this source	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.64	443/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.64
		etor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.28	4.54
		estions reflec			0	3	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	646/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.45
		ations reflect			0	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	476/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.54
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	366/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.50
	_	_		to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	544/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.38
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	1	5	,	4.46	592/1547	4.20	3.75	4.19	4.21	4.46
		was class canc		ained	2	0	0	0	0	5	7		1018/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.58
	-			ching effectiveness	4	1	2	0	0	4			1227/1554		3.80			3.65
9. HOW WO	Julu you g	grade the overa	II Leac	ming effectiveness	-7	_	2	U	U	-1	3	3.07	122//1554	4.10	3.00	4.10	4.05	3.05
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	666/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.76
2. Did th	ne instruc	in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1053/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.72		
3. Was le	ecture mat	explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	468/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.68		
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	637/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.55
5. Did au	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	829/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.06
	Discussion																	
1 Did al	ann dinn			what you learned	12	0	0	0	Λ	0	2	E 00	****/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	****
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1279	3.90	3.91	4.17	4.42	****
				nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1269		3.73		4.41	****
3. Dia tii	ie ilistiut	ctor encourage	IaII ai	id open discussion	12	U	U	U		U	1	4.00	71209	3.11	3.73	4.33	4.41	
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa	nding c	of the material	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	64/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.57
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	7	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	177/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.14
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	119/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provid	e assis	stance	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	64/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.71
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.57
							tribu	ıtior	ı									
		1					_											
Credits E	larned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;		
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			_			-						3 -		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	neral					0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.							ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I O						ner					8	_		-			

? 0

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Page 335 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course		Mean		
									Italii	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1299/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	851/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1132/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1059/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1093/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1189/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	860/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	8		708/1488		4.24	4.47	4.47	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	8		1176/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	1	7		1010/1486		4.04	4.32	4.32	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	1	5		1231/1489	4.21	3.97		4.34	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	812/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.89
Discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1 60	201/1070	2 06	2 00	1 17	4 20	4 60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8 8	0	0	0	0 2	2 1	3 2	4.60	381/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17 4.35	4.20	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0		0		0	3		928/1270	3.91	3.91		4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8 8	3	1	0	1	0	2		1018/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	151/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	210/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	107/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29		4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	44/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20		4.75
• • • •														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work				_			_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.63	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 382			4.78	4.24	****
J. Mere energy proceeds for all the students	11	_	U	U	U	U		3.00	, 362	J. 14	J. 4	1.00	1.27	

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 335 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 336 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 13

Title

BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B)

18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 336 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104 University of Maryland Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 337

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
1 5'1		General	_	. 1	0	0	0	0	_	-		2 0 17	1004/1506	4 10	2 04	4 20	4 20	2 0 11
	1 5	w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	6	5	4		1274/1576			4.30	4.30	3.87
		tor make clear	_	_	0	0 2	0 1	0 1	3 2	5	5 4		1049/1576 1128/1342	4.28	3.92	4.27 4.32	4.28	4.13 3.77
	_	estions reflect ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	2	5	-	4.31	805/1520	4.04		4.32	4.25	4.31
				hat you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7		4.15	748/1465	4.04		4.12	4.25	4.15
				what you learned	2	3	0	1	2	5			1063/1434	3.93		4.14	4.15	3.80
		system clearly		4	1	0	0	1	1	4		4.36	737/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.36
		was class cance		inea	2	0	0	0	0	7			1128/1574			4.64	4.61	4.46
	-			ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9			662/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.11
J. 110W	would you g	rade the overa	II ccaci	ing cricetiveness	2	Ü	O	O	O	,	_	1.31	002/1331	1.10	3.00	1.10	1.05	1.11
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	750/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.43
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	5			1053/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.33
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	792/1486	4.34		4.32	4.32	4.44
		s contribute to	-		0	0	0	0	0	8		4.47	742/1489	4.21		4.32	4.34	4.13
5. Did	audiovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	0	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	823/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.93
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class discu	ssions contrib	ute to v	hat you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1000/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.67
				l to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3		4.40	736/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.40
				l open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2		4.20	852/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	4.20
		chniques succes		-	10	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Labora	-															
		rease understa			5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	122/ 234	4.23		4.23	4.24	4.30
		-	_	ground information	5	0	0	0	3	2		4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.20
	_			or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2		4.80	54/ 229	4.59		4.51	4.48	4.80
		tructor provide			5	0	0	1	1	4		4.10	158/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.10
5. Were	e requiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	4	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	64/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.60
		Semina	r															
5. Were	e criteria f	or grading made			14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****
5 D'1	-	Field N		7.7	1.4	0	0	0	0	-	0	4 00	**** / 206	2 14	2 45	4 00	4 00	ale ale ale ale
5. Did	conferences	help you carry	y out ii	eld activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
O		G GD7		The same of Consider				Das		_			m				M	
	s Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.0						
				? 3														

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 18

HOUPT, JOSHUA (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 338 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student	Course	Evaluati	ion Quest:	ionna:	ire
---------	--------	----------	------------	--------	-----

		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain nev	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1274/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.87
2. Did th	e instruct	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1049/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.13
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1128/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.77
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.31
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	748/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.15
6. Did wr	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	3	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1063/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.80
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	737/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.36
8. How max	ny times v	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1128/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.46
9. How wo	uld you gr	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1060/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.11
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	1111/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.43
2. Did th	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	2	0	6	4	4.00	1411/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.33
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	749/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.44
		s contribute t			5	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1236/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.13
				our understanding	5	5	1	0	0	1	3		692/1277	4.10		4.03		3.93
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1000/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.67
				ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	736/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.40
		_	_	nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	_	4.20			3.73	4.35	4.41	
		chniques succe		d open discussion	10	4	0	0	0	1			****/ 878				4.09	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the material	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	122/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30
				ground information	5	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.20
3. Were n	ecessary r	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	54/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.80
		tructor provid			5	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	158/ 232	4.46	4.14		4.16	4.10
				early specified	4	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	64/ 379	4.50		4.20	4.17	4.60
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 А б					or Ma			0	Graduat		 0	Majo		0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		Kei	quit!	eu I	OT INIC	JULE	>	U	Graduati	=	U	Ma JO) <u> </u>	U
26-33 56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	В 3 С 1		Go	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	L5	Non	-major	15
	3		2	D 0		Ge.	пета	Т				Т	onder-g.	Lau J	LO	NOI1-	·iiia JOE	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0 F 0		רים	ecti [.]					1	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	Moona t	homo -	na+		.h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	۷	P 0		ET.	ectl.	ves				Τ.	#### - 1				_	111
						O+-	h o				-	0	response	es co k	be sign	ıııcan	IL.	
				I 0		Ut.	her				1	.0						
				? 3														

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 16

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 339

			Fre	eque	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	697/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.47

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	735/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	902/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	424/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	670/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	148/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	911/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	662/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.53	

Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 12 4.69 638/1488 4.48 4.24 4.47 4.47 4.84 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 Ω 4 12 4.75 908/1493 4.45 4.43 4.73 4.70 4.82 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 11 4.63 530/1486 4.34 4.04 4.32 4.32 4.81

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 11 4.67 500/1489 4.21 3.97 4.32 4.34 4.83 1 0 0 1 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 1 2 7 4.27 515/1277 4.10 3.72 4.03 4.11 4.27 Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 6 5.00 1/1279 3.96 3.80 4.17 4.20 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 3.91 3.91 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 11 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 3.77 3.73 4.35 4.41 5.00

4. Were special techniques successful 10 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 878 3.79 3.88 4.05 4.09 ****

Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 2 4.17 144/ 234 4.23 4.22 4.23 4.24 4.17 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 Ω 0 1 Ω 4 4.17 171/240 4.16 4.38 4.35 4.32 4.17 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 48/ 229 4.59 4.49 4.51 4.48 4.83 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5 4.83 45/ 232 4.46 4.14 4.29 4.16 4.83 10 0 0 0 1

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 32/ 379 4.50 4.24 4.20 4.17 4.86

Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 375 3.08 3.12 4.01 4.12 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	1	А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-	-	_	
				6	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Instructor: TOMNEY, MATTHEW (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 340

Studer	it Course	Evaluation	n Questionnaire
--------	-----------	------------	-----------------

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 ı															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	697/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.47
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.73
		estions reflect			3	5	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	735/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.38
		ations reflect			1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	902/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.21
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	424/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.47
	_	_		o what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	670/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.27
		system clearly		-	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	148/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.87
		was class cance		inea	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	911/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.53
9. HOW WO	uru you g.	rade the overal	LI LEAC	ming effectiveness	3	_	U	U	U	3	9	4.75	194/1334	4.10	3.00	4.10	4.09	4.55
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.84
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.82
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.81
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	10	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.27
		Discuss																
1 Did al	ogg diggs			what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	5.00
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/12/9	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.42	5.00
		-	_	d to participate d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	5 5	5.00	1/12/0	3.91	3.73	4.35	4.42	5.00
		chniques succes		a open alscussion	10	3	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 878	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were s	pecial te	cilitques succes	SSLUI		10	3	U	U	U	Τ	۷	4.07	/ 6/6	3.19	3.00	4.05	4.09	
		Laborat	cory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understar	nding o	f the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	144/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.17
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequat	e back	ground information	10	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	171/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.17
3. Were n	ecessary ı	materials avail	lable f	or lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	48/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.83
4. Did th	e lab ins	tructor provide	e assis	tance	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	45/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.83
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	32/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.86
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made			15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 1	A 7		Por			or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A / B 5		Ke(4utr.	EU L	ıπ IMG	ישטני	۵	U	G1 adual (=	U	ria J) <u>T</u>	۷
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gor	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non	-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		Gei	icia.	T				_	onder-g.	Lau I	. 0	MOI1-	iiia JUL	7.4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		רום	ecti	760				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		БТ	ECCT.	ves				U	response				_	111
				I O		Oth	202				1	1	respons	נו טו מב	c sign	iiiidl	10	
				5 U		ULI	1CT				1	_						
				f U														

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106 Title

Baltimore County ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 341 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skills fro	m this course	1	0	0	1	3	3	5		1148/1576		3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00
		tor make clear the ex		1	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1227/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.92
		estions reflect the ϵ		1	3	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	. , .		3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00
		ations reflect the ex		1	1	1	0	3	2			1166/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.91
	_	eadings contribute to	_	2	1	1	0	2	3		3.90		4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.90
		ignments contribute t		2	2	1	0	0	4	4		826/1434		3.75	4.14	4.15	4.11
		system clearly expla	ained	2	0	0	0	1	4		4.45	, .		3.87	4.19	4.21	4.45
	-	was class cancelled grade the overall teac	ching effectiveness	2 2	0 0	0	0	0 1	1 6		4.91	469/1574 692/1554		4.76 3.80	4.64	4.61 4.09	4.91 4.19
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	708/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.32
		tor seem interested i		2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	966/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.44
		erial presented and e		3	0	1	0	0	3		4.30				4.32		4.28
		es contribute to what		3	0	1	0	0	3		4.30		4.21	3.97		4.34	4.15
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance y	our understanding	2	3	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	533/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25
ו הוא מו	ace dieco	Discussion assions contribute to	what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	1	0	2 25	1267/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	2.25
		its actively encourage		9	0	2	1	0	1	-		1261/1270		3.91	4.35	4.42	2.23
		tor encourage fair ar		9	0	2	1	0	1	0		1259/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	2.00
		echniques successful	op	9	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 878		3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Laboratory						•	_	_	4 00	100/004		4 00	4 00		4 00
		rease understanding o		3	0	1	0	0	3 2	6 7	4.30	, -		4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30
		led with adequate back		3	0	1 0	0	0 1	3	-	4.40	,	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.40 4.50
		materials available f structor provide assis		3	0	1	0	0	3		4.30	,	4.59 4.46	4.49 4.14	4.29	4.48 4.16	4.30
		its for lab reports cl		3	0	1	0	0	3		4.30	- , -		4.24		4.17	
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made clear	•	7	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	265/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.17
5. Did co	nferences	Field Work help you carry out f	field activities	6	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	207/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.29
		Self Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for all t	the students	6	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	261/ 382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.29
			Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 56-83	2 4	$ \begin{array}{ccc} 1.00-1.99 & 0 \\ 2.00-2.99 & 1 \end{array} $	B 8 C 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	D 0											_			_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1 respons				_	ıh
			3 0 I 0		Ot]	her				1	.0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106 Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Spring 2009

Instructor: WAUCHOPE, ORRET (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 342 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
1 Did vo	u cain ne	General w insights,skills f	rom this course	1	0	0	1	3	3	5	4 00	1148/1576	4 10	3.94	4 30	4.30	4.00
_	_	tor make clear the		1	0	1	0	3	3	5		1227/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	3.92
		estions reflect the		1	3	0	1	1	4	3	4.00			3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00
		ations reflect the		1	1	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1166/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.91
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribute t	o what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	989/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.90
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contribute	to what you learned	2	2	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	826/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.11
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly exp	lained	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	608/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.45
	_	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	1			469/1574		4.76	4.64	4.61	4.91
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overall te	eaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	860/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.19
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures wel	l prepared	7	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1233/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.32
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem interested	l in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	3	3		1390/1493		4.43	4.73	4.70	4.44
		erial presented and		5	0	1	0	0	2			959/1486			4.32	4.32	
		s contribute to wha		5	0	1	0	1	2			1118/1489		3.97	4.32	4.34	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	6	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.25
		Discussion															
		ssions contribute t	-	9	0	2	0	1	1	0		1267/1279		3.80	4.17	4.20	2.25
		ts actively encoura		9	0	2	1	0	1			1261/1270		3.91	4.35	4.42	2.00
		_	and open discussion	9	0	2	1	0	1	0		1259/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	2.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques successful		9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Laboratory															
		rease understanding		3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	, -		4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30
			ckground information	3	0	1	0	0	2			122/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.40
		materiais availabie tructor provide ass	for lab activities	3	0	0 1	0	1	3			133/ 229 137/ 232	4.59 4.46	4.49 4.14	4.51	4.48 4.16	4.50 4.30
		ts for lab reports		3	0	1	0	0	3			137/ 232			4.29	4.17	
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made cle	ar	7	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	265/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.17
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry out	field activities	6	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	207/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.29
		Self Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for all		6	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	261/ 382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.29
			Frequ	encs	r Die	tribi	1 t i 01	n									
			riego	iciicy	DIS	CLID	2010										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	2 4	1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 1	B 8 C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	D 0								-	_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - respons				_	ŗh
			I 0		Ot]	her				1	.0	respons		c argi	ıııcaı		
			? 0														

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Ρ

0

0

1

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 343

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Instructor: Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							_	ncie	5	_		tructor		_		Level	
		Questions	5	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	L														
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	lls from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	1	3.75	1345/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.75
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	851/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.33
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflect	the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	972/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1281/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1214/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.58
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contri	ibute to what you learned	0 £	2	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1063/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.80
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearly	z explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1239/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.75
8. How m	nany times	was class cance	elled	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.64
9. How w	ould you	grade the overal	ll teaching effectiveness	0 8	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	712/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.99
		Lecture	2														
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	932/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.48
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem intere	ested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	1306/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.18
3. Was 1	ecture ma	d and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1010/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.92	
4. Did t	he lectur	what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1192/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.70	
5. Did a	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	0	2	0	4	4.33	463/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.33
		Discuss	sion														
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contribu	ate to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	802/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were	all stude:	nts actively end	couraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage f	fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1142/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.40
4. Were	special t	echniques succes	ssful	7	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Laborat	-														
			nding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86			4.22	4.23	4.24	
		_	te background information		0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29		4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.29
			lable for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	4		119/ 229		4.49	4.51	4.48	4.57
		structor provide		5	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	119/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.43
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab repo	orts clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	145/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.29
			Free	quenc	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	5			Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0 A 1		 Re	auir	 ed f	or Ma	aior	 s	0	 Graduat		0	Majo	 or	1	
28-55	2	0 B 6		110	Jull	cu I	OT 1.10	المارم	_	J	Graduat	_	J	1-104) (<i>-</i>	_	
56-83	5	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	11	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 C 2 2 D 0													5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
	-															,	

Other

10

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B) Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 344

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	1	3.75	1345/1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	851/1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	972/1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1281/1520	4.04	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1214/1465	4.04	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1063/1434	3.93	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1239/1547	4.20	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.65	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1187/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1411/1493	4.45	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1286/1486	4.34	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1313/1489	4.21	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	802/1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	,	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	0	2		1142/1269	3.77	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 878		3.88	4.05	4.09	****
T . D														
Laboratory	_	0	0	0	2	0	_	2 06	100/024	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 0 4	2 06
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	188/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23		3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0 T	3	3	4.29	141/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	119/ 229 119/ 232	4.59 4.46	4.49	4.51	4.48 4.16	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5 5	0	0	0	1	4 3	3	4.43	- ,	4.46	4.14	4.29		4.43
o. were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	Э	U	U	U	Т	3	3	4.29	145/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.29

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

University of Maryland Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 11

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Page 345 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructo Ra			Dept Mean		Level Mean	
		General																	
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1316/	1576	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.82
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1237/	1576	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.91
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1132/	1342	4.04	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	3	5			1246/				4.25	4.25	3.78
	_	-		hat you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8			1123/				4.12	4.09	3.73
		_		what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6			1191/				4.14		3.55
		system clearly		ned	0	0	1	1	1	4			1211/				4.19		3.82
	_	was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	2			665/				4.64		
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	.1 teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	532/	1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.05
		Lecture	9																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/	1488	4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.06
		tor seem intere		_	2	0	0	0	0	3			1053/				4.73	4.70	
		_		plained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1			763/				4.32		3.91
		s contribute to			2	0	0	0	1	4			888/				4.32		
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	2	1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	818/	1277	4.10	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.77
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ate to wi	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/	1279	3.96	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1033/	1270	3.91	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.80
		_		open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1			928/					4.41	
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		6	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	755/	878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	3.33
		Laborat	cory																
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understan	nding of	the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	157/	234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequat	e backg	round information	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	198/	240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.00
	_			r lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4			154/		4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.40
		tructor provide			1	1	0	1	1	5							4.29		3.89
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	148/	379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.27
		Seminar																	
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	clear		6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/	375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.00
		Field W	Iork																
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry		eld activities	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/	326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.00
		Self P																	
5. Were tl	here enou	gh proctors for		e students	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/	382	3.14	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.00
		J 1																	
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Туј	рe			Majors	3		
00-27	0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5						 guir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Gra	duate	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 5																_		
56-83 84-150	2 0	C 1 D 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Und	ler-g	rad 1	11	Non-	-major	10		
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2	D 0 F 0		בות.	ectiv	769				0	###	# _ 1	Means t	here :	are not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	J.JU-4.00	4	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD				U			es to k			_	1++
				1 0							_	•	105	- C1110		,c b191	ıııcaı	10	

Other

10

0

0

I ?

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 11

HOUPT, JOSHUA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 346 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

														_			_	
		Questions			MID	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	_	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept		Level Mean	Sect
		Questions	, 									Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean		меа.
		General																
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	1	2	6	2		1316/1576		3.94		4.30	3.8
		ctor make clear	_	_	0	0	0	1	2	5	3		1237/1576		3.92		4.28	3.9
		uestions reflect			0	3	0	0	2	6			1132/1342				4.30	3.7
		uations reflect	_	_	0	2	0	0	3	5			1246/1520			4.25	4.25	3.7
		eadings contribu		_	0	0	0	0	3	8	0		1123/1465				4.09	3.7
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6			1191/1434					3.5
	_	g system clearly	_	ned	0	0	1	1	1	4			1211/1547			4.19	4.21	
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	2	8		665/1574		4.76		4.61	
. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	l teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1201/1554	4.10	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.0
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	3	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1411/1488	3 4.48	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.0
		ctor seem intere			3	0	0	2	2	2	2		1473/1493		4.43		4.70	4.0
		terial presented		_	3	0	1	1	2	2	2		1367/1486		4.04	4.32	4.32	3.9
		es contribute to			3	0	1	0	3	3			1352/1489			4.32		
		l techniques enh	_		3	5	0	0	1	2	0		943/1277				4.11	
. Dia aa	alovibaa	r ccciniiques cini	ance yo	ar anacrocanaring	3	5	O	O	_	2	U	3.07	J 13 / 12 / /	1.10	3.72	1.05	1.11	٥.
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu		_	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279			4.17	4.20	4.0
		nts actively enc			6	0	0	0	2	2	1		1033/1270				4.42	3.8
		_		open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1269				4.41	4.0
. Were s	pecial t	echniques succes	sful		6	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.79	3.88	4.05	4.09	3.3
		Laborat	ory															
. Did th	e lab in	crease understan	ding of	the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	157/ 234	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.0
. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequat	e backg	round information	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	198/ 240	4.16	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.0
		materials avail			1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	154/ 229	4.59	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.4
. Did th	e lab in	structor provide	assist	ance	1	1	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	181/ 232	4.46	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.8
. Were r	equireme	nts for lab repo	rts cle	arly specified	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	148/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.2
		Seminar																
. Were c	riteria	for grading made			6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.08	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.0
		niala w																
. Did co	nference	Field W s help you carry		eld activities	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.0
Were t	here eno	Self P ugh proctors for		e students	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	2 1 4	3 24	4 08	4 24	3 (
. WCIC C	incre eno	agii proceors ror	all cir	c bedderies	O	O	O	O	3	O	U	3.00	313/ 302	. 3.11	3.21	1.00	1.21	3.0
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
redits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Τχ	<i>r</i> pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Per	anir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat	·	0	 Мајо	 nr	 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		100	-1 W T T I	-u -	OT 1.1C	، ـ د د	_	J	Siddual		5	.·.u) (
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Cer	nera	1				0	Under-	rad 1	11	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		GGI		-				J	JIIGCI - S	,		14011		1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		म ी	ecti [.]	VAS				0	#### -	Means t	here :	are not	enous	rh
Si aa.	0	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD					respons					7++
						O+1	her				1	.0	respons	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	JC 5191	cai		
		I 0					rier				Т	. U						

? 0

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 347 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 125 Questionnaires: 105

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain new in		m this course	3	0	0	1	0	13	88	4.84	211/15	76	4.54	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.84
2. Did the instructor			3	0	0	0	1	16	85	4.82	208/15	76	4.46	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.82
3. Did the exam quest:	ions reflect the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	4	14	86	4.79	263/134	12	4.49	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did other evaluation	ons reflect the exp	pected goals	3	15	0	0	4	11	72	4.78	218/152	20	4.47	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.78
Did assigned reading	_	_	2	4	3	0	7	18	71	4.56	335/146	55	4.29	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.56
6. Did written assignm			2	26	1	1	1	9	65	4.77	184/143	34	4.46	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.77
Was the grading sys		ined	2	0	0	0	4	12	87	4.81	, -		4.33	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.81
8. How many times was	class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	9	94	4.91	, -		4.73	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade	e the overall teach	ning effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	13	90	4.86	138/15	54	3.71	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.86
	Lecture																
1. Were the instructor	r's lectures well :	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	101	4.98	50/148	38	4.54	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.98
2. Did the instructor			1	0	0	0	0		103	4.99	56/149		4.81	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.99
3. Was lecture materia			2	0	0	1	1	16	85	4.80	284/148		4.41	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures co			1	1	0	0	3	11	89	4.83	274/148	39	4.53	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual ted	chniques enhance y	our understanding	7	62	1	1	4	11	19	4.28	515/12	77	3.65	3.72	4.03	4.11	4.28
1 Did -1 di	Discussion	AA	0.77	0	0	^	2	1	4	4 12	**** /105	7.0	****	2 00	4 17	4 00	****
1. Did class discussion		_	97 97	0	0	0	3 2	1 1	4 5		****/12 [*]		****	3.80 3.91	4.17	4.20	****
 Were all students a Did the instructor 			96	0	0	0	3	2	4		****/12		****	3.73	4.35	4.42	****
4. Were special techni	_	i open discussion	96 97	5	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 8		****	3.73	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techni	iques successiui		91	5	1	U	U	U	۷	3.07	/ 0	0		3.00	4.05	4.09	
	Laboratory																
1. Did the lab increas	se understanding of	f the material	104	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	34	****	4.22	4.23	4.24	****
Were you provided were to the provided of the provided	vith adequate backs	ground information	104	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	10	****	4.38	4.35	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instruc			104	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 23		****	4.14	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements f	for lab reports cl	early specified	57	0	1	0	0	43	4	4.02	224/ 3	79	4.02	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.02
	Seminar																
5. Were criteria for			67	0	0	0	33	4	1	3.16	268/ 3	75	3.16	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.16
5 5'1 6 1 1	Field Work		CO	0	0	_	2.0	_	-	2 14	020/ 2/		2 14	2 45	4 00	4 00	2 14
5. Did conferences hel	lp you carry out f	ield activities	69	0	0	0	32	3	Τ	3.14	239/ 32	26	3.14	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.14
	Self Paced																
5. Were there enough p	proctors for all the	ne students	66	0	0	0	33	3	3	3.23	273/ 38	32	3.23	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.23
		_		Dist													
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			-	Гуре	3			Majors	}
	0.00-0.99 0	A 30		Rec	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Gradua	ate		1	Majo	r	1
	1.00-1.99 0	B 26		0	٦٥،٦	ı				0	TTso all a	~	.a 1^	1	NT	mo +	104
	2.00-2.99 21	C 40		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-	-gra	au IU	4	non-	major	104
	84-150									2	####	. Мо	ane +	here s	re not	enoug	rh
Grad. I	J.JU T.UU ZI	P 0		nΤC	ectiv	(CD				۷					ifican	_	111
		I 0		Oth	ner				ρ	2	1 05 201	1000	. co b	c bigi	cai.		
		1 0		JUI					0	_							

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0201 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN

Enrollment:	221
Ougstiennsines:	110

3

Page 348 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 112 Student Cou	ırse	Eval	uati	on Ç	uest	ionn	aire	!					
			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Instructor	Cour	se Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Ran	k Mea	n Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	6	14	28	61	4.23 976/1	576 4.5	4 3.94	4.30	4.30	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	5	24	22	57	4.10 1082/1	576 4.4	6 3.92	4.27	4.28	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	2	19	24	60	4.20 879/1	342 4.4	9 3.86	4.32	4.30	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	6	3	14	20	54	4.16 945/1	520 4.4	7 3.84	4.25	4.25	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	15	8	4	10	27	45	4.03 834/1	465 4.2	9 3.90	4.12	4.09	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	22	4	4	8	29	41	4.15 787/1	434 4.4	6 3.75	4.14	4.15	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	8	10	18	27	46	3.85 1182/1	547 4.3	3 3.87	4.19	4.21	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	1	2	41	63	4.55 1041/1	574 4.7	3 4.76	4.64	4.61	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	43	6	19	40	2	2.56 1521/1	554 3.7	1 3.80	4.10	4.09	2.56
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	6	5	11	34	50	4.10 1203/1	488 4.5	4 4.24	4.47	4.47	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	4	1	3	15	84	4.63 1101/1	493 4.8	1 4.43	4.73	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	5	5	20	28	48	4.03 1094/1	486 4.4	1 4.04	4.32	4.32	4.03
A Did the leadures sentuibute to that the lead	0	2		4	10	2.2	ГΟ	1 00 076/1	400 4 F	2 2 07	1 22	1 21	4 22

2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	4	1	3	15	84	4.63 1101/1493	4.81	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.63
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	5	5	20	28	48	4.03 1094/1486	4.41	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.03
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	2	5	4	12	23	58	4.23 976/1489	4.53	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.23
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	55	13	3	11	6	12	3.02 1147/1277	3.65	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.02
	Discussion													

⊥.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	94	U	8	Τ	U	4	5	2.83 ^^^^/12/9	^ ^ ^ ^	3.80	4.1/	4.20	
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	95	0	4	1	4	4	4	3.18 ****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.42	****
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	95	0	4	3	0	3	7	3.35 ****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.41	****
4.	Were special techniques successful	96	13	0	2	1	0	0	2.33 ****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.09	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	110	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	234	****	4.22	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	111	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	240	****	4.38	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	229	****	4.49	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	111	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	232	****	4.14	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	379	4.02	4.24	4.20	4.17	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	37	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	8
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	В	42						
56-83	28	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	3	Under-grad	110	Non-major	104
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	35	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	s there	are not enoug	jh
				P	0			responses to	o be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	87	-			
				2	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101 Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 349 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	818/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.38
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	798/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	4.38
	d the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	5		4.38	735/1342		3.86	4.32		4.38
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	3			429/1520		3.84		4.25	4.5
				what you learned	1	1 0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1465		3.90	4.12	4.09	4.2
	_	-		o what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1434		3.75	4.14	4.15	4.4
		g system clearly		-	2	0	0	1	0	3			1041/1547		3.87	4.19	4.21	4.0
		was class cance	-		2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1574		4.76	4.64	4.61	5.0
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	0	0	5		4.29	682/1554					4.1
		Lecture	a															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lectures	-	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	722/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1101/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.5
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.50					4.32	4.4
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489		3.97	4.32	4.34	4.5
				our understanding	0	5	0	0	0	2			463/1277				4.11	
		Laborat	oru															
l Did the	a lah ind		_	of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 234	4 20	4 22	4 23	4.24	4.8
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information						0	0	0	0	1		4.80	44/ 240		4.38	4.35		4.8
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities						0	0	0	0	3		4.40	154/ 229	4.38	4.49		4.48	4.4
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance						0	0	1	0	2		4.00	165/ 232		4.14		4.16	4.0
				early specified	3 1	0	0	0	1	4		4.14	193/ 379		4.24			4.1
		Semina	·															
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading made		•	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	209/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.5
		Field V	vi1-															
5. Did cor	nferences			ield activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	180/ 326	3.54	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.5
		Self I																
5. Were th	nere enou	sell i ugh proctors fo		the students	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	193/ 382	3.48	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.8
				Frequ	encs	n Dist	rib	ut i o	n									
				_	.01107	220												
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re 	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
				Р 0								responses to be significant					nt	
				Ι 0	Other						7							
				? 2														

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB B
ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 8

Instructor:

18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 350 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	pt UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	818/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.38
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	,		3.92	4.27	4.28	4.38
	d the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	5		4.38	735/1342		3.86			4.3
	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	3			429/1520		3.84		4.25	4.5
				what you learned	0 1	1 0	0	0	1	3		4.29	- ,		3.90	4.12		4.2
	_	-		o what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	_		524/1434		3.75	4.14		4.4
		g system clearl		-	2	0	0	1	0	3			1041/1547		3.87	4.19		4.0
		was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1574				4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	1	5			924/1554					4.1
		Lectur																
1. Were th	ne instru	Lectur actor's lecture	-	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1155/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.4
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.5
				explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2			891/1486		4.04			4.4
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	3		4.25					4.34	
				our understanding	4	0 4	0	0	0	1			****/1277				4.11	
		Labora	toru															
Did +bc	a lah ind		_	of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 234	4 20	4.22	1 22	1 21	4.8
 Did the lab increase understanding of the material Were you provided with adequate background information 						0	0	0	0	1		4.80	44/ 240			4.35		4.8
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities						0	0	0	0	3		4.40	,		4.49		4.48	4.4
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance						0	0	1	0	2	_	4.00	- ,		4.14		4.16	4.0
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					3 1	0	0	0	1	4		4.14			4.24			4.1
		Q																
5. Were cr	riteria f	Semina for grading mad			6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	209/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.5
J. MOLO 01	100110			•		Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	_	Ü	3.30	2007, 370	3.23	0.11	1.01		3.3
E Did gor	forongos	Field		field activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	٥	2 50	180/ 326	2 5/	2 / 5	1 02	1 22	2 5
). Dia coi	irerences	s help you carr	y out i	leid activities	4	U	U	U	2	۷	U	3.50	100/ 320	3.34	3.43	4.03	4.23	3.5
- Wassa th		Self agh proctors fo		.b	3	0	0	0	3	0	2	2 00	193/ 382	2 40	2 24	4 00	4 04	2 0
o. were ti	iere enoc	agii proctors ro	r arr t	lie students	3	U	U	U	3	U	۷	3.00	193/ 302	3.40	3.24	4.00	4.24	3.0
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	 guir	 ed f	or Ma	ajor	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			-			-						3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enouc	h
				Р 0							responses to be significat						_	
				I 0	Other							7						
		2 2				OCIICI												

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 351

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A) Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Frequencies A 1 2 3 4				5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	=															
		ew insights,skil			0	0	2	0	1	1	9	4.15	1050/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.15
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						2	0	0	2	7	4.09	1082/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.09
	_	aestions reflect		1 0	1	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	972/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00
		ations reflect			1	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	731/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.36
				what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	5		1043/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.83
				o what you learned	2	2	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	826/1434		3.75	4.14	4.15	4.11
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	985/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574		4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1227/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.21
		Lecture	9															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	1233/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.21
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	1	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	1384/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.30
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	1101/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							2	0	0	3	7	4.08	1075/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.26
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	2	3	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1107/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.13
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.80
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	559/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.60
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage i	air an	d open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.20
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful	_	9	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Laborat	cory															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understar	nding c	of the material	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	122/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30
				ground information	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.30
				or lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	133/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50
		structor provide			3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.30
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	3	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	105/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.40
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	2			Ty	ne			Majors	
														- 				
00-27 28-55	0 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
26-33 56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Go:	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non	-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-2.99	1	D 0		Ge.	пета	т				т	onder-9	ıau I		MOI1-	·iiia JOE	ТТ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	D 0 F 0		רים	ecti [.]	a				0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo -	aro not	onomo	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	3	P 0		БŢ	EC.LI.	ves				U					_	111
				I 0	Other							responses to be significant 7						
				1 0		UT.	ner.					I						

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102 University of Maryland Page 352 JUL 2, 2009 GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B) Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	13

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	Mean
General			_	•	_				4050/4556			4 00	4 00	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	Τ	9		1050/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	0	2	7		1082/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	972/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	731/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	5		1043/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	826/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	985/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	194/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	970/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	0	5		1270/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	596/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	Δ	4.43	789/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	1	0	1	1		1149/1277	3.30		4.03	4.11	
3. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	,		1	U			3.00	1140/12//	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	559/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	***
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	122/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	137/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	133/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50

Frequency Distribution

3 0 1 0 0 3 6 4.30 137/ 232 3.44 4.14 4.29 4.16 4.30 3 0 1 0 0 2 7 4.40 105/379 3.91 4.24 4.20 4.17 4.40

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	Graduate 0		2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0103 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Instructor: FISHBED
Enrollment: 15

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2009

Page 353

JUL 2, 2009

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructo: Rai	_	Course	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	1	0	6	1	7	3.87	1274/	1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.87
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	2	2	3	3	5		1410/		3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.47
		uestions reflect			0	0	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1166/	1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.67
		uations reflect			0	8	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1431/	1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.29
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	1	3	2	2	5	2	3.07	1374/	1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.07
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	7	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1204/	1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.50
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1380/	1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.40
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/	1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.87
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	2	0	7	1	3	3.23	1396/	1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.12
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lectures	well :	prepared	1	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	1212/	1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.68
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1404/	1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.97
		_		xplained clearly	1	0	3	0	4	3	4	3.36	1371/	1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.32
		es contribute to		-	1	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1270/	1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.14
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	2	6	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1246/	1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.43
		Discuss																	
				what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	1		****/		3.58		4.17	4.20	****
		_	_	d to participate	12	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/		3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****
		-		d open discussion	12	0	1	1	0	1	0		****/		2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful		13	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Laborat	-				_		_	_									
		crease understar			4	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	140/		4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.18
_	_	_		ground information	4	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36			4.32		4.35	4.32	4.36
	_			or lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	197/		4.38		4.51	4.48	4.09
		structor provide nts for lab repo			4	0 2	2	2	6 1	0 4	1 2	2.64 3.18			3.44	4.14 4.24	4.29	4.16 4.17	2.64 3.18
	•	_		• •															
		Seminar					•						,				4 =0		
				announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/		****		4.72	4.67	****
5. Were d	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear		9	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	287/	375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	3.00
5 D'1	-	Field V			0	0	0	0	4	•	-	2 55	100/	206	2 54	2 45	4 00	4 00	2 55
5. Dia co	nierences	s help you carry	out I	ield activities	8	0	0	0	4	2	Τ	3.57	177/	326	3.54	3.45	4.03	4.23	3.57
F 77	.1	Self I			0	0	0	0	-	1	0	2 15	201/	200	2 40	2 04	4 00	4 04	2 17
5. were t	nere enou	ugh proctors for	all t	ne students	9	0	0	0	5	1	U	3.17	291/	382	3.48	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.17
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Grad	 duat	 e	0	 Мајо	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			_			_							3		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Unde	er-g	rad :	15	Non-	-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	###	# - I	Means	there a	are not	enoug	gh
				P 0									res	pons	es to 1	be sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	3							

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0103 Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Page 354

								_	ncies				tructor		Dept			
		Questions	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Ме
		General	1															
. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from th	nis course	0	0	1	0	6	1	7	3.87	1274/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.
. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the expect	ted goals	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1410/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.
. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflect	t the exped	cted goals	0	0		1	2	5	5	3.67	1166/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.
		ations reflect			0	8		0	1				1431/1520				4.25	
		eadings contrib		_	0	1	3		2				1374/1465					
		signments contr		-		7	0						1204/1434					
		g system clearly		i	0	0	2	2	3				1380/1547					
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0				547/1574					
. How wou	ld you g	grade the overa	ll teaching	g effectivenes:	s 4	0	1	1	6	3	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3
		Lecture	е															
. Were th	e instru	actor's lecture:	s well prep	pared	8	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	1425/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3
		ctor seem inter			7	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1443/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3
. Was lec	ture mat	erial presented	d and expla	ained clearly	8	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1383/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3
. Did the	lecture	es contribute to	o what you	learned	8	0	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	1463/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3
. Did aud	iovisual	l techniques enl	hance your	understanding	7	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2
		Discus	sion															
Did cla	ss discu	assions contrib	ute to what	you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	*
		nts actively end			12	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	*
. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and or	pen discussion	12	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	*
. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succes	ssful		13	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	*
		Labora	tory															
. Did the	lab ind	crease understa	nding of th	ne material	4	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	140/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4
. Were yo	u provid	ded with adequat	te backgrou	and information	1 4	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	128/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4
. Were ne	cessary	materials avail	lable for l	lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	197/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4
. Did the	lab ins	structor provide	e assistano	ce	4	0	2	2	6	0	1	2.64	228/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	2
. Were re	quiremer	nts for lab repo	orts clearl	ly specified	2	2	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	369/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3
		Semina	r															
. Were as	signed t	opics relevant	to the ann	nounced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.72	4.67	*
		for grading made			9	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	3
		Field V	Work															
. Did con	ferences	s help you carry	y out field	d activities	8	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	177/ 326	3.54	3.45	4.03	4.23	3
		Self 1	Paced															
. Were th	ere enou	agh proctors for	r all the s	students	9	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.48	3.24	4.08	4.24	3
				Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
modita Es	boan	Cum CDA	7	Ermostod Crodo				Do	2222				т.	~			Mojoro	~
redits Ea 		Cum. GPA		Expected Grade:	• 				asons				Ту:				Majors	,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	
28-55 56-83	-	1.00-1.99	-	B 2 C 1		0	2002	1				0	IIndor ~	d 1	Е	More	ma i a	
つローベイ	5	2.00-2.99	1			Ge:	nera	Т				U	Under-g	rad 1	. 5	Non-	-major	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Electives 0													

Other

13

0

0

0

I

?

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 355 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 15

Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 356 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LIU, YUANYUAN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A) Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 357

JUL 2, 2009

				Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
	General														
1. Did you gain ne	w insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1509/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.2
2. Did the instruc	tor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1438/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.4
3. Did the exam qu	estions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1249/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.4
4. Did other evalu	ations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1281/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.7
5. Did assigned re	adings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1004/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.8
6. Did written ass	ignments contribute to what you learned	. 2	2	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1305/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.2
7. Was the grading	system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1303/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.6
8. How many times	was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.9
9. How would you g	rade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1331/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.2
	Lecture														
1. Were the instru	ctor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1368/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.6
2. Did the instruc	tor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1255/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.4
	erial presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1245/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.7
	s contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1363/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.3
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	974/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.6
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab inc	rease understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	204/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	3.6
	ed with adequate background information	. 3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	148/ 240		4.38	4.35	4.32	4.2
	materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	220/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	3.7
_	tructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	220/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.1
	ts for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	357/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.6
	Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 3		 Pe	auir	 ed f	or Ma	iore		0	 Graduat		0	Maic		0

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105 University of Maryland
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County
Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. B) Spring 2009

Excellment: 19

Enrollment:	18				_		
Ouestionnaires:	11		Student.	Course	Evaluation	n Ouestionnaire	

			Fre	equei	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	2	2	3 20	1509/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	2		1438/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	1		1249/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	1		1281/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	3		1004/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	1	3	1		1305/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	6	1		1303/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574		4.76	4.64	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	3	2	0		1448/1554		3.80	4.10	4.09	3.22
J. now would fou grade one overdir bodoning circoorveness	-	_	_	ŭ	J	_	Ū	3.00	1110/1001	3.30	3.00	1.10	1.05	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	204/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	148/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	220/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	220/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	357/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.63
Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utio	ı									

Page 358 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor:	FISH
Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 359 JUL 2, 2009

								_	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	=	this course	3	0	3	0	3	2	0	2.50	1566/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	2.50
		ctor make clear			2	0	3	1	0	5	0		1552/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	2.78
		uestions reflec	_	_	3	0	2	0	3	2	1		1294/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	3.00
	_	uations reflect		1 0	3	3	0	3	0	2	0		1493/1520		3.84	4.25	4.25	2.80
				hat you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	1		1343/1465		3.90	4.12	4.09	3.2
				what you learned	2	3	1	2	1	1	1		1399/1434		3.75	4.14	4.15	2.8
		g system clearl			2	0	2	1	5	1	0		1513/1547		3.87		4.21	2.5
		was class canc		neu .	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	, -		4.76	4.64		
	-			ing effectiveness	3	1	1	1	3	2	0		1493/1554			4.10		
). 110w woo	ara you g	grade the overa	II ccaci	ing circultychess	3	_	_	_	3	2	U	2.00	1100/1001	3.30	3.00	1.10	1.05	2.0
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	s well p	repared	3	0	2	1	0	3	2	3.25	1428/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	2.7
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	3	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1465/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.0
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1367/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	2.8
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what y	ou learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1381/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.8
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	3	4	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1207/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.7
		Discus																
1 Did al:	acc dica			hat you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	3 00	****/1279	3 50	3.80	4.17	4.20	***
				to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1270		3.91	4.35	4.42	***
				open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1269		3.73	4.35		***
J. Dia circ	z inberae	cor encourage	rair and	open arbeabbion		Ü	-	o	Ü	Ü	Ü	1.00	7 1200	2.00	3.73	1.55	1.11	
		Labora																
1. Did th ϵ	e lab ind	crease understa	nding of	the material	3	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	228/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	2.88
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te backg	round information	3	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	233/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.1
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avai	lable fo	r lab activities	4	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	224/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	3.2
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance	3	0	5	0	2	1	0	1.88	231/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	1.8
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	377/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	2.7
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
				-	-													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			_			-						3		
28-55		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	11
28-55 56-83	2	4.00-4.99																
56-83			2	D 0														
56-83 84-150	2 3 0	3.00-3.49	2	= -		E]	ect i	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ιh
56-83	3		2	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - respons				_	jh
56-83 84-150	3	3.00-3.49		= -			ecti [.] her	ves				0	#### - respons				_	ιh

University of Maryland Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 11

a. 1 .	~		
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 360

JUL 2, 2009

								Fre	mier	ncies			Inci	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
			Genera			_			•		_						4 00	4 00	
			w insights,ski			3	0	3	0	3	2	0		1566/1576		3.94	4.30	4.30	2.50
			tor make clear			2	0	3	Ţ	0	5	0		1552/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	2.78
			estions reflec			3	0	2	0	3	2			1294/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	3.00
			ations reflect			3	3	0	3	0	2	0		1493/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	2.80
		-	_		what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	Τ		1343/1465		3.90	4.12	4.09	3.22
			_		o what you learned	2	3	1	2	1	1	1		1399/1434		3.75	4.14	4.15	2.83
			system clearly		ined	2	0	2	1	5	1	0		1513/1547		3.87	4.19	4.21	2.56
		-	was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574		4.76	4.64	4.61	4.89
9. F	How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	4	0	0	2.43	1531/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.64
			Lectur	е															
1. V	Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	7	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1482/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	2.75
2. I	oid the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	7	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1492/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.06
3. V	Vas lec	ture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	7	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1480/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	2.81
			es contribute to			7	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1466/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.88
			- ·																
1 -			Discus			1.0	0	^	^	1	^	0	2 00	++++ /1 OTO	2 50	2 00	4 1 1	4 00	****
					what you learned	10	0	0 1	0	U T	0	0		****/1279			4.17	4.20	****
					ed to participate nd open discussion	10 10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1270 ****/1269		3.91 3.73	4.35 4.35	4.42	****
3. I	JIG CHE	e instruc	ctor encourage	Lair ai	a open aiscussion	10	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	***/1269	2.99	3./3	4.35	4.41	
			Labora	tory															
1. I	Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the material	3	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	228/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	2.88
2. V	Vere yo	u provid	led with adequa	te bacł	ground information	3	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	233/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.13
3. V	Vere ne	ecessary	materials avail	lable f	for lab activities	4	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	224/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	3.29
4. I	Did the	lab ins	structor provide	e assis	stance	3	0	5	0	2	1	0	1.88	231/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	1.88
5. V	Vere re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	377/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	2.75
					Frequ	ency	, Dist	tribu	ution	1									
					•	-													
Cred	dits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-	 -27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			,			,	-		2_ 3.3.3.0.0	-	-) 0		-
56-		2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-q	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	11
	-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		001		_				-	011001 9.		_	2.021		

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107 University of Maryland
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A) Spring 2009
Enrollment: 17

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 361

JUL 2, 2009

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107 University of Maryland ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Title Spring 2009 Instructor: ANDERSON, BRIAN (Instr. B)

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Ctudont	Course	Errolination	Ougstionnoine
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 362

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

									equer		5	_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 Genera	 1															
1. [Did vou	gain nev	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1000/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.21
			tor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1040/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	4.14
			estions reflec			0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1119/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.79
4. I	oid oth	er evalua	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	3	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	929/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.18
5. I	oid ass	igned rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	668/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.23
6. I	oid wri	tten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1162/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	3.63
7. V	Was the	grading	system clearly	y expla	ained -	1	0	0	3	0	3	7	4.08	992/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	4.08
8. F	How man	y times v	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.93
9. F	How wou	ld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	1345/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.42
	,		Lectur			•			•	_	_	_							
			ctor's lecture			9	0	Ţ	0	Ţ	2	Ţ		1406/1488		4.24	4.47	4.47	3.88
			tor seem inter		-	9	0	0	1	2	0	2		1467/1493		4.43	4.73	4.70	4.01
					explained clearly	9	0	0 1	0	3	T	1		1307/1486		4.04	4.32	4.32	3.84
			s contribute t		-	9	0 3	1	0	3 1	0	T		1415/1489		3.97 3.72	4.32		3.68
5. L	ola aua:	lovisual	techniques en	nance y	your understanding	9	3	Т	U	Т	U	0	2.00	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.56
			Labora	torv															
1. I	oid the	lab inc		-	of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	35/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.75
				_	ground information	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	54/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.75
	_	_	_		for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	107/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.63
			tructor provid			6	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	215/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.25
5. W	Were re	quiremen	ts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	6	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	193/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.14
					T		- -	1		_									
					Freq	lency	7 Dist	trib	utioi	1									
Cred	dits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	\$
00-	 -27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-		0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7							-	-	- 21212121	-	-	5 -		-
56-	-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	14
84-	-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0													-	
Gra	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh

Other

11

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 363

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A) Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	988/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.22
		ctor make clear			1	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1253/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.88
		estions reflec		_	1	0	1	1	1	1	4		1132/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75
	_	uations reflect			1	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	511/1520		3.84	4.25	4.25	4.50
				what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	738/1465		3.90	4.12	4.09	4.17
	-	_		o what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	748/1434		3.75	4.14	4.15	4.20
		system clearl		-	1	0	0	2	1	1	4		1167/1547		3.87	4.19	4.21	3.88
		was class canc			1	0	1	0	0	0	7		1079/1574		4.76	4.64	4.61	
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3			1194/1554			4.10		3.71
		Lectur	ے															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	_	prepared	2	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1233/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.60
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	2	1	4		1344/1493		4.43	4.73	4.70	4.14
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1			1039/1486		4.04	4.32	4.32	3.82
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	2	2	3		1035/1489		3.97	4.32	4.34	3.57
				our understanding	3	3	1	0	0	0	2		943/1277		3.72	4.03		3.67
5. Did au	idiovisua.	r teciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	3	3	1	U	U	U	4	3.07	943/12//	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.07
		Discus									_							
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1279		3.80	4.17	4.20	****
				ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	****
				nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269		3.73	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
		Labora	-															
		crease understa			3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	91/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.50
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	93/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.67
4. Did th	e lab ins	structor provid	e assis	stance	3	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	195/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.67
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	55/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	4.67
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	:			Ψv	pe			Majors	
				·										- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijors	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		~		,				0	1	,	0			0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge	nera	Τ.				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								•						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -					jh
				P 0			_						respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					9						
				? 0														

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County LIU, YUANYUAN (Instr. B) Spring 2009

Instructor: LIU, Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 364 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions						Fr	_	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Cour	se D	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mea	ın M	/lean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne		s from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	988/15	6 3.7	7 3	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.22
			he expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	2	4		1253/15			3.92	4.27	4.28	3.88
			the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	1	4		1132/13			3.86	4.32	4.30	3.75
	_		he expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	511/15:			3.84	4.25	4.25	4.50
			e to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	738/140	55 3.7	1 3	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.17
			ute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	748/143	34 3.7	2 3	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.20
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	explained	1	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1167/15	17 3.4	9 3	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.88
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancel	led	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	1079/15	4 4.8	8 4	1.76	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1194/15	3.5	6 3	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.71
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lectures	well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1433/148	3.8	0 4	1.24	4.47	4.47	3.60
			ted in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	0	3		1411/149			1.43	4.73	4.70	4.14
			and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	1	2		1330/148			1.04	4.32	4.32	3.82
		es contribute to		4	0	1	0	3	0	1		1415/148				4.32		3.57
			nce your understanding	4	3	1	0	0	0	1		****/12				4.03		3.67
		Discussi	an.															
1 Did al	acc dica		e to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/12	9 3.5	Ω 3	3.80	4.17	4.20	****
			uraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/12			3.91	4.35	4.42	****
			ir and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/120			3.73	4.35	4.41	****
		echniques success	_	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 8'			3.88	4.05	4.09	****
	_	- 1																
1 544 46	- l-b	Laborato:	ry ing of the material	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	74/ 0	34 4.2	0 4	1.22	4.23	4 24	4.50
			9	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	74/ 23 91/ 24			1.38	4.23	4.24	4.50
			background information ble for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	_	4.67	91/ 2			1.49	4.51	4.48	4.67
		structor provide		3	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	195/ 2			1.14	4.29	4.46	3.67
		_	ts clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	55 / 3'		1 4		4.29	4.17	
J. Weie i	equiremen	ics for tab repor	cs clearly specified	3	U	U	U	U	4	4	4.07	55/ 5	9 3.3	, T - T	1.24	4.20	4.1/	4.07
1 Wassa		Seminar	- the summered thems	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/	35 ***	. + _	- 00	4.72	4.67	++++
i. were a	.ssignea (lopics relevant to	o the announced theme	8	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	***/	35 """	^ 5	5.00	4.72	4.67	
			Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			ŗ	уре				Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 O A 5		Re	 auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 s	0	 Gradua	 ite	0		Majo	 or	0
28-55	1		0 B 4			-1		10		-	-	01000		J				ū
56-83	1		2 C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-	grad	9		Non-	-major	9
84-150	5		2 D 0										J	-			3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means	the	ere a	re not	enoug	ŗh
			P 0										ses to				_	
			I O		Ot:	her					9	-			-			
			? 0															

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A) Spring 2009

University of Maryland Page 365
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	17				-	
Questionnaires:	10		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

F

Ρ

I

3.50-4.00

Grad.

0

0

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did	vou gain	new insights, skil	=	m this course	2	0	0	Ο	3	3	2	3 88	1266/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.88
		uctor make clear			2	0	0	1	1	2	4		1058/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.13
		questions reflect			3	0	0	0	3	1	_	4.00	,		3.86	4.32	4.30	
		luations reflect			2	2	0	0	1	2			768/1520		3.84	4.25	4.25	4.33
		readings contribu			2	1	0	0	0	3		4.57				4.12		4.57
	_	-		o what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	2		4.00				4.14		4.00
		ng system clearly		-	2	0	1	0	2	3			1294/1547		3.87	4.19		3.63
	_	s was class cance	_	IIICa	2	0	0	0	0	1			527/1574		4.76	4.64		4.88
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	3	0		1381/1554			4.10	4.09	
J. 110W	would you	grade the overal	i ccac	ning circuit veness	3	Ü	Ü	-	3	3	Ü	3.23	1301, 1331	3.30	3.00	1.10	1.05	3.71
		Lecture																
		ructor's lectures			4	0	0	1	2	2	1		1388/1488			4.47	4.47	3.50
		uctor seem intere			4	0	0	0	1	1			1210/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73		4.50
		aterial presented			4	0	1	1	1	2			1400/1486		4.04	4.32	4.32	
		res contribute to			4	0	0	1	2	1			1283/1489		3.97			
5. Did	audiovisu	al techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	4	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	889/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.75
		Laborat	ory															
1. Did	the lab i	ncrease understar	nding o	f the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
2. Were	you prov	ided with adequat	e back	ground information	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	91/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.50
				or lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	133/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50
		nstructor provide			4	0	1	1	1	0	3		206/ 232	3.44		4.29	4.16	3.50
		ents for lab repo			4	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	355/ 379		4.24		4.17	3.67
		Seminar	-															
5. Were	criteria	for grading made			9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	****
				_		<u> </u>	,											
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	ı
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	aiors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4			=			J								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									5				3	-
		2.50 3.19										_						

Electives

Other

0

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County
Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B) Spring 2009

University of Maryland Page 366
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	17							
Questionnaires:	10		Student	Course	Eva	luation	Questionnaire	

						Fr	eauei	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			_		Mean	
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1266/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.88
		ctor make clear the		2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1058/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	4.13
3. Did th	ie exam q	uestions reflect the	expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	972/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect the	expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	768/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute t	o what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	322/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.57
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contribute	to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	878/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1294/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	827/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.50
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.17
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to wha	t you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.67
		Laboratory															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understanding	of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
			ckground information	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	91/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.50
3. Were n	ecessary	materials available	for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	133/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.50
4. Did th	e lab ins	structor provide ass	istance	4	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	206/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.50
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	4	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	355/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	3.67
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made cle	ar	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	3.25	3.12	4.01	4.12	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Re						0	 Graduat		0	Ma = a		1
28-55	0	1.00-0.99 0	A 3 B 4		Red	quir	eu I	OT Mg	ajor	5	U	Graduat	е	U	Majo	Σ	1

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_	_		
				2	0						

University of Maryland ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110 Page 367 Title JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 9

Student	('Ollrge	Evaluation	()11egt101	nnaire

			F۳	eanei	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Λ	2	2	1	1	2	2 67	1562/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	2	2		1523/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	1	2		1329/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	0	1	3		1496/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	2		1302/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	2	0		1412/1434		3.75	4.14	4.15	2.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	2	2	0		1533/1547	3.49	3.73	4.19	4.21	2.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	911/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	2	2	0		1524/1554		3.80	4.10	4.09	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	_	1	2 44	1398/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5 1	Τ.		1398/1488	4.12	4.44	4.47	4.47	3.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	7	1		1421/1493	3.78	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	0	2	7		1363/1489	3.70	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	0	1	3 1	0		1257/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.77
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	5	۷	U	Τ.	1	U	4.43	1237/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	157/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	217/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	172/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	165/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	ı
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ijors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majc	 or	0

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)

Spring 2009

Page 368 JUL 2, 2009

Enrollment:	18	
0	0	

Enrollment:	18	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1														
General	^	0	2	_	1	1	0	0 67	1560/1576	2 77	2 04	4 20	4 20	0 67
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	1	Ţ	2		1562/1576		3.94	4.30	4.30	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	۷	2		1523/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	Τ	1	2		1329/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	Τ	0	1	3		1496/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	2		1302/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	2	0		1412/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	2.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	2	2	0		1533/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	2.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6		911/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	1390/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	0	2	0		1470/1488		4.24	4.47	4.47	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	1	1	1		1490/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1286/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1478/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.25
Laboratory														
	_	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	157/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5		1	Τ .	-	1	2		- ,					
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	Ţ	0	0	Ţ		3.75	217/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	2	Ι.	4.33	172/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	Ţ	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	165/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	****
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 369 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 0 2 6 3 3.83 1299/1576 3.77 3.94 4.30 4.30 3.83 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 1 4 4 2 3.42 1433/1576 3.70 3.92 4.27 4.28 3.42 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 2 3 1 4 3.25 1269/1342 3.59 3.86 4.32 4.30 3.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 2 2 1 0 2 5 3.70 1281/1520 3.80 3.84 4.25 4.25 3.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 4 0 2 3 3 3.08 1372/1465 3.71 3.90 4.12 4.09 3.08 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 1 3 1 4 $3.60 \ 1172/1434 \ 3.72 \ 3.75 \ 4.14 \ 4.15 \ 3.60$ 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 2 0 3 3 4 3.58 1311/1547 3.49 3.87 4.19 4.21 3.58 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1574 4.88 4.76 4.64 4.61 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 3 3 4 2 3.42 1345/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.09 3.71 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 0 3 5 3 3.75 1353/1488 3.80 4.24 4.47 4.47 3.66 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 1 1 2 3 5 3.83 1447/1493 4.12 4.43 4.73 4.70 3.92 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 3 3 2 3 3.25 1386/1486 3.78 4.04 4.32 4.32 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 2 2 1 5 3.64 1290/1489 3.67 3.97 4.32 4.34 3.48 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 6 2 0 1 1 2 3.17 1128/1277 3.30 3.72 4.03 4.11 3.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1279 3.58 3.80 4.17 4.20 **** 12 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1270 3.59 3.91 4.35 4.42 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 00 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1269 2.99 3.73 4.35 4.41 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 93/ 234 4.20 4.22 4.23 4.24 4.44 3 4 4.22 154/ 240 4.32 4.38 4.35 4.32 4.22 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 0 2 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 172/229 4.38 4.49 4.51 4.48 4.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 132/232 3.44 4.14 4.29 4.16 4.33 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 1 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 165/379 3.91 4.24 4.20 4.17 4.22

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-		_	
				2	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: GUEI, JULES Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 13

Page 370 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Deddelle	COULDC	E varaacron	Queberonnarie

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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-	-	-	
				2	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County

Page 371 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A) Spring 2009 Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 5 7 1 3.69 1370/1576 3.77 3.94 4.30 4.30 3.69 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 2 3 4 4 3.77 1307/1576 3.70 3.92 4.27 4.28 3.77 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 2 1 5 4 3.69 1157/1342 3.59 3.86 4.32 4.30 3.69 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 4 5 3 3.92 1153/1520 3.80 3.84 4.25 4.25 3.92 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 3 5 4 3.85 1035/1465 3.71 3.90 4.12 4.09 3.85 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 1 4 5 4.18 758/1434 3.72 3.75 4.14 4.15 4.187. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 1 3 5 3.54 1333/1547 3.49 3.87 4.19 4.21 3.54 0 0 2 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 586/1574 4.88 4.76 4.64 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1 1 5 4 1 3.25 1390/1554 3.56 3.80 4.10 4.09 3.76 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 2 5 5 4.08 1212/1488 3.80 4.24 4.47 4.47 4.23 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 1337/1493 4.12 4.43 4.73 4.70 4.40 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 3 2 4 3 3.38 1365/1486 3.78 4.04 4.32 4.32 3.82 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 1 1 4 4 3.38 1350/1489 3.67 3.97 4.32 4.34 3.88 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 2 0 3 0 2 3.00 1149/1277 3.30 3.72 4.03 4.11 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 1 2 1 0 3.00 1186/1279 3.58 3.80 4.17 4.20 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 1 1 0 2 0 2.75 1238/1270 3.59 3.91 4.35 4.42 2.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1210/1269 2.99 3.73 4.35 4.41 3.00 4. Were special techniques successful 9 2 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 878 3.50 3.88 4.05 4.09 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 153/234 4.20 4.22 4.23 4.24 4.11 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 1 0 5 3 4.11 186/240 4.32 4.38 4.35 4.32 4.11 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 1 0 6 2 4.00 203/229 4.38 4.49 4.51 4.48 4.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 1 2 2 0 3 1 2.88 225/232 3.44 4.14 4.29 4.16 2.88 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 1 2 3 3 3.89 329/379 3.91 4.24 4.20 4.17 3.89 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.67 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.53 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.61 4.22 **** Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Majors Reasons 00-27 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Maior 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 в 6 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 56-83 1 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12 84-150 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 3 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 3.50-4.00 2 responses to be significant I 0 Other 12 1

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 372

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ANDERSON, BRIAN (Instr. B) Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionin	WII CD.]			Student Cot	11 20	± va⊥l	ua L I ()II Q(aco c l	. 01111	атте							
		Overtion	~		MD	NT7	Fre	equer 2	ncies	4	_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question 	s 		NK 	NA ·			3 	- 4 		Mean	Rank 	mean 	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	5	7	1		1370/1576		3.94		4.30	3.69
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	3	4			1307/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.77
		estions reflec			0	0	1	2	1	5			1157/1342		3.86	4.32	4.30	3.69
		ations reflect			0	1 0	0 1	0 0	4 3	5			1153/1520	3.80	3.84		4.25	3.92
				what you learned what you learned	0	2	0	1	3 1	5 4			1035/1465 758/1434		3.90 3.75	4.12	4.09 4.15	3.85 4.18
		g system clearl			0	0	2	2	1	3			1333/1547	3.49	3.75	4.19	4.15	3.54
		was class canc		Inea	0	0	0	0	0	_		4.85				4.64	4.61	
	-			ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6			692/1554					3.76
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well ;	orepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1018/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.23
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	n the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1210/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	xplained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	959/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.82	
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	845/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	3.88	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	7	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.00
		Discus	sion															
			what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1186/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.00	
			d to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	0		1238/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	2.75	
				d open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	2			1210/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	3.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		9	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
1 511 11	. 1 .1. /	Labora	_	6 . L	4	0	0	0	1	_	0	4 11	152 / 024	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 04	4 11
		crease understa			4	0	0	0 1	1	6 5	3	4.11	153/ 234	4.20		4.23	4.24	4.11
				ground information or lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	5 6	-	4.11	186/ 240 203/ 229	4.32	4.38	4.35		4.11
	_	structor provid			4	1	2	2	0	3		2.88	225/ 232			4.29	4.16	2.88
		_		early specified	4	0	0	1	2	3		3.89	329/ 379	3.91		4.20	4.17	
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available	for ind:	ividual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	***	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did re	search pr	rojects contrib	ute to v	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	1		
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	в 6														
56-83	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	major	12		
84-150	3	D 0																
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	յh
				P 0							_	0	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.2						
				? 1														

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113 Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 373 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque:	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	. Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Λ	3	4	2	3 80	1257/1576	3 77	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	2		1303/1576		3.92	4.27	4.28	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	3	_		1283/1342					3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	0	1			1300/1520		3.84			3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2			1012/1465					3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	0			777/1434			4.14		4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	2			1418/1547				4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1			508/1574				4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	4	-		1381/1554			4.10	4.09	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	1	U	2	-	U	3.29	1301/1334	3.30	3.00	4.10	4.00	3.40
Lecture		_	_	_	_		_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	3			1324/1488			4.47		3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	0			1395/1493		4.43	4.73	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3			1245/1486					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4			976/1489		3.97			
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1208/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	0	0			1255/1269		3.73	4.35	4.41	2.25
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	74/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	44/ 240		4.38		4.32	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 229				4.48	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	0	1		3.20						
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	1	1		3.20						3.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
0.15 - 1														
Self Paced		0	0	•	•	-	0	4 00		de de de 1	****	4 60	4 00	ale ale ale d
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credita Farned Cum CDA Franceted Credea	Frequency Distributi												Majawa	_

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113 University of Maryland Page 374 JUL 2, 2009 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B) Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 13 Ouestionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 4 2 3.89 1257/1576 3.77 3.94 4.30 4.30 3.89 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 4 2 3.78 1303/1576 3.70 3.92 4.27 4.28 3.78 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 2 0 3 1 3.14 1283/1342 3.59 3.86 4.32 4.30 3.14 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 1 0 1 3 3.67 1300/1520 3.80 3.84 4.25 4.25 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 1012/1465 3.71 3.90 4.12 4.09 3.88 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 1 0 4 4.17 777/1434 3.72 3.75 4.14 4.15 4.17 1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 $2 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 3.22 \ 1418/1547 \quad 3.49 \quad 3.87 \quad 4.19 \quad 4.21 \quad 3.22$

	3	-	-	_	_	_	_							
8	. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89 508/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	4.89
9	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67 1227/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	3.48
	Lecture													
1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00 1233/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	3.94
2	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67 1053/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.40
3	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00 1101/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.89

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 0 1 3 4.20 997/1489 3.67 3.97 4.32 4.34 4.21 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 0 1 0 0 2 4.00 692/1277 3.30 3.72 4.03 4.11 3.50 Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 1 3.00 1186/1279 3.58 3.80 4.17 4.20 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 2 3.00 1208/1270 3.59 3.91 4.35 4.42 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1 0 0 1 2.25 1255/1269 2.99 3.73 4.35 4.41 2.25 4. Were special techniques successful 5 3 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 878 3.50 3.88 4.05 4.09 ****

Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 2 4.50 74/ 234 4.20 4.22 4.23 4.24 4.50 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 Ω Ω Ω 1 4 4.80 44/ 240 4.32 4.38 4.35 4.32 4.80

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/ 229 4.38 4.49 4.51 4.48 5.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 1 2 3.20 216/232 3.44 4.14 4.29 4.16 3.20 4 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 2 1 1 1 3.20 369/379 3.91 4.24 4.20 4.17 3.20

Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.67 ****

Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 **** Ω Ω 1 Λ 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 3.92 ****

Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.60 4.83 ****

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** **** 4.83 4.89 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 Ω

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

University of Maryland Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9

Page 375 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

				Fr	eane:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain n	new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	861/1576	3.77	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.33
	actor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1248/1576	3.70	3.92	4.27	4.28	3.89
	questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1166/1342	3.59	3.86	4.32	4.30	3.67
4. Did other eval	luations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1320/1520	3.80	3.84	4.25	4.25	3.63
5. Did assigned r	readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1028/1465	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.09	3.86
6. Did written as	ssignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	797/1434	3.72	3.75	4.14	4.15	4.14
7. Was the grading	ng system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1443/1547	3.49	3.87	4.19	4.21	3.13
8. How many times	was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you	$\ \ \text{grade the overall teaching effectiveness}$	2	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1340/1554	3.56	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.05
	Lecture														
1. Were the instr	ructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1192/1488	3.80	4.24	4.47	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instru	actor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1210/1493	4.12	4.43	4.73	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture ma	aterial presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	959/1486	3.78	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.54
4. Did the lectur	res contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1205/1489	3.67	3.97	4.32	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisua	al techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1207/1277	3.30	3.72	4.03	4.11	2.75
	Discussion														
1. Did class disc	cussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	3.58	3.80	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all stude	ents actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	3.59	3.91	4.35	4.42	***
3. Did the instru	actor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	2.99	3.73	4.35	4.41	***
4. Were special t	techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.09	****
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab in	ncrease understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	157/ 234	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.00
2. Were you provi	ided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 240	4.32	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.80
3. Were necessary	y materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.38	4.49	4.51	4.48	4.80
4. Did the lab in	nstructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	185/ 232	3.44	4.14	4.29	4.16	3.80
5. Were requireme	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 379	3.91	4.24	4.20	4.17	5.00	
	Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	l	
00-27 0		Re	 auir	ed f	 or Ma	ior	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2	
28-55 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6			-1011		110	- , 1	-	-	01 44440	-	-		-	_

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	Λ						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Questionnaires: 9

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

Page 376 JUL 2, 2009 Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B) Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 401 0101

CHEM/STAT THERMODYNAMI

Title Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 377 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	893/1576	4.30	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.30
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	6	2		1237/1576	3.90	3.92	4.27	4.35	3.90
		estions reflec			0	0	1	0	1	5	3		1068/1342	3.90	3.86	4.32	4.46	3.90
		ations reflect			0	2	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1185/1520	3.88	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.88
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	4	1	3	2	0	2.30	1457/1465	2.30	3.90	4.12	4.22	2.30
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1021/1434	3.88	3.75	4.14	4.30	3.88
		system clearl		ned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	971/1547	4.10	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.10
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.70
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	860/1554	4.11	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.11
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1072/1488	4.30	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.30
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.60
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1307/1486	3.60	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.60
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1065/1489	4.10	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.10
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1099/1277	3.29	3.72	4.03	4.04	3.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	couraged	l to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	827/1270	4.25	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.25
				l open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	819/1269	4.25	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.25
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.33	****
		Labora	tory															
2. Were y	ou provid	ed with adequa	te backs	ground information	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.45	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clea	r the ex	spected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were y	our conta	cts with the i	nstructo	or helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 3		Re	 muir		or Ma			0	Graduat		2	Majo		8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		1101	2011	Lu I	J_ 1'1C	ء ـ ب	,	•	Graduat	_	_	1.10.10	<i>,</i> _	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	c. u.	-				-	onacı g.		-	1,011		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	are not	enone	rh
	=		-	P 0									respons				_	, -
				I O		Ot1	her					5		~				
							-											

Course-Section: CHEM 433 0101 University of Maryland BIOCHEM OF NUCLEIC ACI Baltimore County

Page 378 Title JUL 2, 2009 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6		
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluat:	on Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 379 JUL 2, 2009

Instructor:	HOLEWINSKI, RON	(Instr. A)			Spring 2009	
Enrollment:	12					
Questionnaires:	12		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sec
1 Did	General		0	0	0	0	2	4	_	4 22	061/1576	4 40	2 04	4 20	1 10	4 2
	in new insights,skills fro structor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	2 2	4 4	6 6	4.33	861/1576 851/1576		3.94 3.92	4.30	4.46 4.35	4.3
	am questions reflect the ex		0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	899/1342		3.86	4.32	4.35	4.1
	evaluations reflect the ex		0	0	0	0	5	2	5		1041/1520		3.84	4.25	4.38	4.0
	ed readings contribute to		0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	850/1465		3.90	4.12	4.22	4.0
	n assignments contribute t		0	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	878/1434		3.75	4.14	4.30	4.0
	ading system clearly expla		0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42			3.87	4.19	4.24	
_	imes was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574		4.76	4.64	4.69	5.0
-	you grade the overall tead	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	9	1	4.00					4.24	
	Lecture															
. Were the i	nstructor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	822/1488	4.68	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.7
	structor seem interested i		1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1306/1493		4.43	4.73	4.80	4.5
. Was lecture	e material presented and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	944/1486	4.51	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.
. Did the le	ctures contribute to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	539/1489	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.
. Did audiov	isual techniques enhance y	our understanding	1	2	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.53	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.
	Laboratory															
. Did the la	o increase understanding o	f the material	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	50/ 234	4.65	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.6
. Were you p	rovided with adequate back	ground information	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	69/ 240	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.
	sary materials available f		0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	133/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.
	o instructor provide assis		0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	57/ 232	4.77	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.
. Were requi	rements for lab reports cl	early specified	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	55/ 379	4.30	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.
	Seminar															
	ned topics relevant to the		11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.77	***
	structor available for ind		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.69	4.69	***
	ch projects contribute to		11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72		5.00	4.64	4.64	**
_	tations contribute to what ria for grading made clear	-	11 11	0	0	0 1	0	1	0		****/ 80 ****/ 375	****	****	4.61 4.01	4.52 3.90	**:
. were crite.	ria for grading made clear		11	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/ 3/5		3.12	4.01	3.90	
		Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earne	d Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	 А б		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0	в 5														
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	1:
84-150 6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0														
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
		I 0		Oth	ner				1	.2						
		? 0														

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. B) Enrollment: 12

Ouestionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionna	ire
--------------------------------------	-----

Page 380

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 2 4 6 4.33 861/1576 4.40 3.94 4.30 4.46 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 6 4.33 851/1576 4.30 3.92 4.27 4.35 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 899/1342 4.21 3.86 4.32 4.46 4.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 5 2 5 4.00 1041/1520 4.20 3.84 4.25 4.38 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 0 1 0 0 2 4.00 850/1465 3.89 3.90 4.12 4.22 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 2 1 7 4.00 878/1434 4.17 3.75 4.14 4.30 4.007. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 3 7 4.42 673/1547 4.40 3.87 4.19 4.24 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1574 4.97 4.76 4.64 4.69 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 623/1554 4.14 3.80 4.10 4.24 4.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1488 4.68 4.24 4.47 4.55 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1053/1493 4.51 4.43 4.73 4.80 4.52 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 891/1486 4.51 4.04 4.32 4.41 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 955/1489 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.38 4.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1277 4.53 3.72 4.03 4.04 4.67 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.67 50/ 234 4.65 4.22 4.23 4.28 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 69/ 240 4.80 4.38 4.35 4.45 4.67 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 133/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.70 4.50 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 57/ 232 4.77 4.14 4.29 4.56 4.75 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 55/ 379 4.30 4.24 4.20 4.19 4.67 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.72 4.77 **** 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.69 4.69 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.64 **** 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.61 4.52 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 375 **** 3.12 4.01 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201 University of Maryland Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 381 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

14

Instructor:	HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. A)	Spring 2009
Enrollment:	17	
Ouestionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Р

I 0

0

-								-										
							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera				_				_								
		new insights,ski			1	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	697/1576	4.40	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.47
		uctor make clear		_	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	929/1576	4.30	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.27
		questions reflec			0	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	835/1342	4.21	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.25
		luations reflect			1	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	683/1520	4.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.40
	_	-		what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	3	3		1088/1465	3.89	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.78
		_		to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2		4.33	594/1434	4.17	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.33
		ng system clearl		ained	0	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	718/1547	4.40	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.38
		s was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.97	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.94
9. How	www.would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	892/1554	4.14	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.10
		Lectur	_															
1 ฟิอร	ce the inst	ructor's lecture		nrenared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	750/1488	4.68	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.59
		uctor seem inter			1	0	0	1	2	3	9		1321/1493	4.51	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.50
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	-	4.57	596/1486	4.51	4.04	4.73	4.41	4.71
		res contribute t			1	0	0	0	2	2	11		579/1489	4.40	3.97			4.71
				you rearned your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	9	4.43			3.72			4.36
5. DIC	audiovisu	ai teciniques en	nance y	Your understanding	Т	Τ	U	1	Т	3	9	4.43	303/12//	4.53	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.40
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	d class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	3.80	4.17	4.31	3.40
2. Wer	re all stude	ents actively en	courage	ed to participate	11	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1187/1270	3.20	3.91	4.35	4.53	3.20
3. Did	d the instr	uctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	3.20	3.73	4.35	4.55	3.20
4. Wer	re special	techniques succe	ssful	_	11	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.33	***
		T -1																
1		Labora	-	5 . 1	0	0	_	•	-	_	1.0	4 6 4	E4 / 024	4 65	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 6 4
		ncrease understa			2	0	0	0	Ţ	3	10	4.64	54/ 234	4.65	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.64
				ground information	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	23/ 240	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.93
				for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	59/ 229	4.64	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.79
		nstructor provid			2	0	0	0	0	3		4.79	52/ 232	4.77	4.14	4.29		4.79
5. Wer	re requireme	ents for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	2	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	305/ 379	4.30	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.93
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
	_																	
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	5
00-27	7 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	5 0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	3 1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	16
84-15	50 8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3				-	
Grad.		3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	₇ h
				D 0	Electives 0					1-			_	-				

Other

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201 University of Maryland Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 17 Ouestionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 382

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 0 9 4.47 697/1576 4.40 3.94 4.30 4.46 4.47 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 3 9 4.27 929/1576 4.30 3.92 4.27 4.35 4.27 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 3 10 4.25 835/1342 4.21 3.86 4.32 4.46 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 0 3 10 4.40 683/1520 4.20 3.84 4.25 4.38 4.40 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 6 1 0 2 3 3.78 1088/1465 3.89 3.90 4.12 4.22 3.78 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 1 2 10 4.33 594/1434 4.17 3.75 4.14 4.30 4.337. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 1 2 11 4.38 718/1547 4.40 3.87 4.19 4.24 4.38 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 328/1574 4.97 4.76 4.64 4.69 4.94 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 3 6 5 4.14 827/1554 4.14 3.80 4.10 4.24 4.10 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 786/1488 4.68 4.24 4.47 4.55 4.59 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 1053/1493 4.51 4.43 4.73 4.80 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 221/1486 4.51 4.04 4.32 4.41 4.71 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 0 1 1 5 4.13 1050/1489 4.40 3.97 4.32 4.38 4.36 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 309/1277 4.53 3.72 4.03 4.04 4.46 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 1 2 3.40 1106/1279 3.40 3.80 4.17 4.31 3.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 2 1 1 3.20 1187/1270 3.20 3.91 4.35 4.53 3.20 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 1 1 1 0 2 3.20 1188/1269 3.20 3.73 4.35 4.55 3.20 4. Were special techniques successful 11 4 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 878 **** 3.88 4.05 4.33 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 3 10 4.64 54/ 234 4.65 4.22 4.23 4.28 4.64 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 Ω 0 1 13 4.93 23/ 240 4.80 4.38 4.35 4.45 4.93 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 59/ 229 4.64 4.49 4.51 4.70 4.79 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 52/ 232 4.77 4.14 4.29 4.56 4.79 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 0 2 3 3 6 3.93 305/379 4.30 4.24 4.20 4.19 3.93

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101

Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM

Instructor: FORD, DIANA L.

Enrollment: 86
Questionnaires: 66

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 383 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Question	ns		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	u gain new	insights,sk	ills fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	9	13	43	4.52	609/1576	4.52	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.52
2. Did th	e instruct	or make clear	r the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	0	7	11	46	4.55	542/1576	4.55	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.55
				expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	18	44	4.66	418/1342	4.66	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.66
		tions reflect			1	24	0	2	3	12	24	4.41		4.41	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.41
				what you learned	2	7	0	2	7	14	34	4.40	513/1465	4.40	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.40
		_		o what you learned	1 2	15 1	1 2	1 1	8 7	15 12	25	4.24	704/1434	4.24	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.24
		system clear: as class can		irnea	2	4	1	0	0	34	41 25		673/1547 1236/1574	4.41 4.37	3.87 4.76	4.19	4.24	4.41 4.37
	-			hing effectiveness	14	2	0	1	9	24	16	4.10		4.10	3.80	4.10		4.10
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	1	4	17	42	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.56
				n the subject	2	0	0	2	7	22	33	4.34	1316/1493	4.34	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.34
				explained clearly	3	0	0	2	9	21	31	4.29	936/1486	4.29	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.29
		contribute t		-	3	2	1	1	10	14	35	4.33	899/1489	4.33	3.97	4.32	4.38	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nhance y	our understanding	4	7	1	4	9	15	26	4.11	653/1277	4.11	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.11
		Discus																
				what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.31	****
		_	_	d to participate	64	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/1270	****	3.91	4.35	4.53	***
3. Did th	e instruct	or encourage	fair an	d open discussion	64	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	****	3.73	4.35	4.55	****
1 5/3 41	. 1 -1- 4	Labora	_	6 th	6 F	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** / 024	****	4 00	4 00	4 00	****
			_	of the material	65	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 234 ****/ 240	****	4.22	4.23	4.28	****
_	_	_		ground information or lab activities	65 65	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	4.38	4.35	4.45 4.70	****
	-	ructor provi			65	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	4.14	4.29	4.56	****
		_		early specified	60	0	0	0	0	0	6		****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.19	***
		Semina	ar															
1. Were a	ssigned to	pics relevant	t to the	announced theme	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was th	e instruct	or available	for ind	lividual attention	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did re	search pro	jects contrib	oute to	what you learned	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	de clear		65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	3.90	****
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	help you car	ry out f	ield activities	65	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03	3.97	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 37		Rec	uire	ed f	or M	 ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	r or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 14														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 3		Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 6	54	Non-	major	64
84-150	32	3.00-3.49	13	D 0														_
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	25	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0		a					_		respons	es to b	e sign	ıfican	ıt	
				I 0		Otł	ıer				5	4						
				? 3														

Course-Section: CHEM 455 0101 Title INTRO BIOMEDICINAL CHE

Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH

Enrollment: 81 Questionnaires: 64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 384 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA		eque 2	ncie 3		5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
		 Genera																
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	1	0	5	5	51	4.69	373/1576	4.69	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.69
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	1	3	10	48	4.69	350/1576		3.92	4.27	4.35	4.69
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	1	5	9	47	4.65	430/1342		3.86	4.32	4.46	4.65
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	4	7	36	4.68	320/1520		3.84	4.25	4.38	4.68
				what you learned	3	0	5	1	10	10	35	4.13	768/1465	4.13	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.13
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	3	26	0	0	3	3	29	4.74	201/1434	4.74	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.74
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	0	0	5	3	53	4.79	207/1547	4.79	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.79
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	0	3	58	4.95	235/1574	4.95	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.95
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	55	4.87	129/1554	4.87	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.87
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	59	4.95	124/1488	4.95	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	61	4.98	112/1493	4.98	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.98
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	10	52	4.84	241/1486	4.84	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.84
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	56	4.87	228/1489	4.87	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					17	21	1	0	3	5	17	4.42	385/1277	4.42	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.42
Discussion																		
				what you learned	55	0	1	0	3	1			****/1279		3.80	4.17	4.31	****
				d to participate	55	0	2	1	0	2			****/1270		3.91		4.53	****
		_		d open discussion	55	0	2	1	1	0			****/1269		3.73	4.35		****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	essful		56	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.88	4.05	4.33	****
		Labora	_															
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	ite back	ground information	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.38	4.35	4.45	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 25		Re	guir	ed f	or M	 aior		1	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 20										-	-) ~		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	11	C 11		Ge	nera	1			1	.8	Under-g	rad 6	51	Non-	major	54
84-150											_	-					5	
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	19	F 0		El	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	.8	-		3			
				? 1														

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 385

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A) Enrollment: 1.0

Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Instructor Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 4.33 861/1576 4.44 3.94 4.30 4.46 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 851/1576 4.33 3.92 4.27 4.35 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 770/1342 4.48 3.86 4.32 4.46 4.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 768/1520 4.35 3.84 4.25 4.38 4.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 0 3 1 2 3.83 1043/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.22 3.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 4 2 4.00 878/1434 4.14 3.75 4.14 4.30 4.007. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 624/1547 4.56 3.87 4.19 4.24 4.44 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 508/1574 4.89 4.76 4.64 4.69 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 5 3 4.38 571/1554 4.08 3.80 4.10 4.24 4.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 278/1488 4.50 4.24 4.47 4.55 4.62 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 868/1493 4.66 4.43 4.73 4.80 4.77 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 4 4 4.33 891/1486 4.03 4.04 4.32 4.41 4.07 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 8 4.78 350/1489 4.47 3.97 4.32 4.38 4.47 0 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 1 2 5 4.22 560/1277 4.47 3.72 4.03 4.04 4.22 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1279 4.50 3.80 4.17 4.31 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1270 4.75 3.91 4.35 4.53 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1269 4.75 3.73 4.35 4.55 **** 7 0 0 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/ 878 4.33 3.88 4.05 4.33 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 110/234 3.94 4.22 4.23 4.28 4.38 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 183/240 4.13 4.38 4.35 4.45 4.13 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 107/ 229 4.75 4.49 4.51 4.70 4.63 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 85/232 4.63 4.14 4.29 4.56 4.63 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 155/379 4.06 4.24 4.20 4.19 4.25 Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO Baltimore County

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 386

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 10
Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Instructor Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 4.33 861/1576 4.44 3.94 4.30 4.46 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 851/1576 4.33 3.92 4.27 4.35 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 770/1342 4.48 3.86 4.32 4.46 4.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 768/1520 4.35 3.84 4.25 4.38 4.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 0 3 1 2 3.83 1043/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.22 3.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 4 2 4.00 878/1434 4.14 3.75 4.14 4.30 4.007. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 624/1547 4.56 3.87 4.19 4.24 4.44 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 508/1574 4.89 4.76 4.64 4.69 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 5 2 4.29 682/1554 4.08 3.80 4.10 4.24 4.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 750/1488 4.50 4.24 4.47 4.55 4.62 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 810/1493 4.66 4.43 4.73 4.80 4.77 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 1003/1486 4.03 4.04 4.32 4.41 4.07 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 579/1489 4.47 3.97 4.32 4.38 4.47 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/1277 4.47 3.72 4.03 4.04 4.22 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1279 4.50 3.80 4.17 4.31 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1270 4.75 3.91 4.35 4.53 **** 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1269 4.75 3.73 4.35 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/ 878 4.33 3.88 4.05 4.33 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 110/234 3.94 4.22 4.23 4.28 4.38 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 183/240 4.13 4.38 4.35 4.45 4.13 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 107/ 229 4.75 4.49 4.51 4.70 4.63 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 85/232 4.63 4.14 4.29 4.56 4.63 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 155/379 4.06 4.24 4.20 4.19 4.25

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 387 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,skil		course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	861/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.33
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the expected	qoals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33		4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.33
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.33
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contribu	ite to what you	u learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1043/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.83
6. Did wr	itten ass:	ignments contri	bute to what	you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	878/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explained	-	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.44
8. How man	ny times v	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	l teaching ef	fectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1194/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.17
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	d	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75		4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.77
		erial presented		_	5	0	0	0	2	1	1		1253/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.07
		s contribute to			5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25		4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47
		techniques enh			5	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.22
		-	-	J														
		Discuss			_			•	•	_		4 00		4 = 0			4 0 4	
		ssions contribu			7	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	****
		ts actively end			7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	****
		tor encourage f	_	discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sstul		7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	****
		Laborat																
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understar	iding of the ma	aterial	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 234		4.22	4.23	4.28	4.38
		ed with adequat			1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13
		materials avail		activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	. ,		4.49	4.51		4.63
		tructor provide			1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232		4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63
5. Were re	equirement	ts for lab repo	orts clearly s	pecified	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	155/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.25
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expe	cted Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 2		 Ra		 ed f	or Ma	iore		0	Graduat		2	Majo		8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	-	B 3		1/6	darr,	cu I	JI MA	ء عال ر	_	9	Graduati	_	_	ra J	-	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99		C 2		Go.	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	1
84-150						GC.	···c··a.	_				9	onder g.	Lau	,	14011-	a JUI	Τ.
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						r1.	ecti	Ves				0	#### - I	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						Ηď		v CD				9	response				_) ± ±
	I 0					O+	her					9	T Cabour	-D -C - L	C DIGI	ıııcaı		
				? 0		UC.	-11					_						
				. 0														

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO (Instr. D)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: KISER, JOHN Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9

Page 388 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011760	Evaluation	Olipetion	סמוכמו

			Frequencies			3			ructor	Course Dept				Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	861/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	770/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1043/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	878/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	624/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	1		1101/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	4.47	3.72		4.04	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	****/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1270	4.75	3.91	4.17	4.53	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 878		3.88	4.05	4.33	****
1. Were special tecinifques successful	,	U	1	U	U	_	U	2.50	, 676	4.33	3.00	1.05	4.55	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 234		4.22	4.23	4.28	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	107/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	155/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.25
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıtioı	1									

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102 University of Maryland Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 389

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		S		NR	NA	1	equei 2	3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	Genera	 1															
gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from this	course	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	568/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.56
instruc	tor make clear	the expected	goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33
exam qu	estions reflec	t the expected	goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.63
er evalu	ations reflect	the expected	goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.38
igned re	adings contrib	ute to what yo	u learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.89
			you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.29
				0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.67
				0	0	0	0		1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89
.ld you g	grade the overa	ll teaching ef	fectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	849/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.00
	Lectur	e															
e instru	ctor's lecture	s well prepare	d	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.39
instruc	tor seem inter	ested in the s	ubject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.55
ture mat	erial presente	d and explaine	d clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	851/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.99
lecture	s contribute t	o what you lea	rned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	228/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47
iovisual	techniques en	hance your und	erstanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	181/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.71
	Discus	sion															
ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to what yo	u learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	4.50
1 studen	nts actively en	couraged to pa	rticipate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.75
instruc	tor encourage	fair and open	discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.75
ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	4.33
	Labora	tory															
lab inc	rease understa	nding of the m	aterial	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	209/ 234	3.94	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.50
u provid	led with adequa	te background	information	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13
cessary	materials avai	lable for lab	activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	40/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.88
lab ins	structor provid	e assistance		1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	85/ 232	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63
quiremen	its for lab rep	orts clearly s	pecified	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	332/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.88
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
rned	Cum. GPA	Expe	cted Grades				Rea	asons	;			Tv	oe .			Maiors	3
					Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	U	Graduat	9	2	Majo	r	5
		-			Co	noro	1				1	IIndon «	rad	7	Non	madom	4
		-			Ge.	nera.	Т				т	onder-g.	Lau	/	MOI1-	·iiia JOE	4
					וים	0a+ i :					0	#### 1	Moona +	horo a	vo not	onomo	rh
۷	3.30-4.00	-			БŢ	ecrl,	v C S				U					_	İII
			- *		O+-	hor					0	respons	נו טו פי	e sign	ıııcaı	ıL	
					UE.	ner.					0						
	exam quer evaluigned retten assignading y times ld you get instructure material example. It is to be a superior to be a super	exam questions reflecter evaluations reflecter evaluations reflecter evaluations reflected ere evaluations reflected ere evaluations reflected evaluations reflected in the sasignments contracted by times was class canceld you grade the overall evaluation of the contraction of th	exam questions reflect the expected er evaluations reflect the expected igned readings contribute to what yo tten assignments contribute to what grading system clearly explained y times was class cancelled ld you grade the overall teaching ef Lecture e instructor's lectures well prepare instructor seem interested in the sture material presented and explaine lectures contribute to what you lead iovisual techniques enhance your und Discussion ss discussions contribute to what yo lad instructor encourage fair and open ecial techniques successful Laboratory Laborator	Lecture e instructor's lectures well prepared instructor seem interested in the subject ture material presented and explained clearly lectures contribute to what you learned iovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion ss discussions contribute to what you learned l students actively encouraged to participate instructor encourage fair and open discussion ecial techniques successful Laboratory lab increase understanding of the material u provided with adequate background information cessary materials available for lab activities lab instructor provide assistance quirements for lab reports clearly specified Frequence Cum. GPA Expected Grades O 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0	exam questions reflect the expected goals er evaluations reflect the expected goals of goals igned readings contribute to what you learned tten assignments contribute to what you learned of grading system clearly explained of grading system clearly in the subject of instructor seem interested in the subject of ture material presented and explained clearly of lectures contribute to what you learned of grading system clearly explained of grading system clearly explained I students actively encouraged to participate of instructor encourage fair and open discussion of grading system clearly specified I aboratory of lab increase understanding of the material of provided with adequate background information of grading system clearly specified I aboratory of lab increase understanding of the material of provided with adequate background information of grading system clearly specified I approvided with adequate background information of grading system clearly specified Of gra	exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 er evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 igned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 y times was class cancelled 0 0 0 ld you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 Lecture e instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 ture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 iovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 Discussion ss discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 l students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 ecial techniques successful 5 1 Laboratory lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 u provided with adequate background information 1 0 cessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 lab instructor provide assistance quirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 Frequency Dis rned Cum. GPA Expected Grades 1 Cum. GPA Expected Grades 1 Frequency Dis 2	exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 455/1342 er evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 3 3 5 4.63 719/1520 er evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 719/1520 gined readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 2 2 4 3.89 1004/1465 tten assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 1 3 3 3 4.29 647/1434 grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 7 4.88 39 1004/1465 y times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.88 293/1488 instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 293/1488 instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 293/1488 instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 233/1493 ture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 251/1489 iovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 228/1489 iovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 181/1277 Discussion so discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.71 181/1277 latinstructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 445/1279 ecial techniques successful 5 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 414/1269 ecial techniques successful 5 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 414/1269 ecial techniques successful 5 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 40/229 lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 40/229 lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.88 40/229 lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.88 40/229 quirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 332/379 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribu	exam questions reflect the expected goals	exam questions reflect the expected goals	exam questions reflect the expected goals	Example example expected goals						

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 390

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 10

Ouestionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 0 8 4.56 568/1576 4.44 3.94 4.30 4.46 4.56 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 851/1576 4.33 3.92 4.27 4.35 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 455/1342 4.48 3.86 4.32 4.46 4.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 719/1520 4.35 3.84 4.25 4.38 4.38 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 2 2 4 3.89 1004/1465 3.86 3.90 4.12 4.22 3.89

Lecture

7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 1048/1488 4.50 4.24 4.47 4.55 4.39 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 1053/1493 4.66 4.43 4.73 4.80 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 1101/1486 4.03 4.04 4.32 4.41 3.99 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 696/1489 4.47 3.97 4.32 4.38 4.47 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1277 4.47 3.72 4.03 4.04 4.71

6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 647/1434 4.14 3.75 4.14 4.30 4.29

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 3 2 2 3.86 1096/1554 4.08 3.80 4.10 4.24 4.00

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 445/1279 4.50 3.80 4.17 4.31 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 412/1270 4.75 3.91 4.35 4.53 4.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion $5 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 3 \ 4.75 \ 444/1269 \ 4.75 \ 3.73 \ 4.35 \ 4.55 \ 4.75$

4. Were special techniques successful 5 1 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 322/ 878 4.33 3.88 4.05 4.33 4.33

0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 339/1547 4.56 3.87 4.19 4.24 4.67 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 508/1574 4.89 4.76 4.64 4.69 4.89

Laboratory

1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 0 3 2 2 3.50 209/ 234 3.94 4.22 4.23 4.28 3.502. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0 1 5 2 4.13 183/240 4.13 4.38 4.35 4.45 4.13 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 40/229 4.75 4.49 4.51 4.70 4.88 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 85/232 4.63 4.14 4.29 4.56 4.63 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 332/379 4.06 4.24 4.20 4.19 3.88

Frequency Distribution

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102 University of Maryland Page 391 Title JUL 2, 2009 ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C) 10 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10				-	
Questionnaires:	9		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Quebeloni	iaiics.			beac	aciic cou	IDC	Буат	uacı	OII Q	ucbc.	LOIIII	<i>x</i> ±± C	•						
										ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec.
		Question	ıs			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		Genera	 il																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this cours	se	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	568/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.5
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.3
		uestions reflec				0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.6
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.3
. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you lea	arned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.8
		signments contr			learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.2
		g system clearl		ained		0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.6
3. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.76	4.64	4.69	4.8
). How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ıll tead	ching effect:	iveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	924/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.0
		Lectur	re																
. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared		3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1171/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.
. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subjec	ct	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1321/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.
		terial presente			early	4	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1233/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.
		es contribute t				5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.
. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	nhance 3	your understa	anding	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.
		Discus																	
		ussions contrib				5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279		3.80	4.17	4.31	4.5
		nts actively er				5	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	412/1270		3.91		4.53	4.
		ctor encourage		nd open discu	ussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3		444/1269		3.73	4.35		
. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful			5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	4.
		Labora	_																
		crease understa	_			1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	209/ 234			4.23	4.28	3.
_	_	ded with adequa		_		1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	183/ 240		4.38	4.35	4.45	4.
		materials avai			/ities	1	0	0	0	0	1	7		40/ 229		4.49	4.51	4.70	
		structor provid				1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	85/ 232			4.29	4.56	4.
. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specif	fied	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	332/ 379	4.06	4.24	4.20	4.19	3.
					Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected	Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4														
56-02	1	2 00-2 00	Λ	C	2		Co	noro	7				1	IIndor-a	224	7	Mon	maior	1

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102 University of Maryland Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO (Instr. D)

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 392

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KISER, JOHN

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	-	om this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	568/1576	4.44	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.56
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.33
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.48	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.63
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.35	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.38
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.89
				to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.14	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.29
		system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1547	4.56	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.67
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574		4.76	4.64	4.69	4.89
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	924/1554	4.08	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1171/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.39
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1321/1493	4.66	4.43	4.73	4.80	4.55
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1233/1486	4.03	4.04	4.32	4.41	3.99
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.47
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	4.47	3.72	4.03	4.04	4.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.80	4.17	4.31	4.50
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.75
				nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	3.73	4.35	4.55	4.75
		chniques succe		-	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.33	4.33
		Labora	torv															
1 Did the	e lah inc		_	of the material	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	209/ 234	3 94	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.50
			_	ground information	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	183/ 240	4.13	4.38	4.35	4.45	4.13
				for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	40/ 229	4.75	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.88
		tructor provid			1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	85/ 232		4.14	4.29	4.56	4.63
		_		early specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	332/ 379		4.24	4.20	4.19	3.88
				Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio:	n									
a 11. 5	,	a ana			_			_					_					
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA	· 	Expected Grades				Re:	asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		a -		7				1	Timedos:		7	M		4
56-83	1 2	2.00-2.99	0 2	C 2 D 0		Ge	nera	Τ				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2			ריים	0 a t d :					٥	инии -	Moona +	homo -		- ono	-h
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	۷	F 0 P 0		БŢ	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ìII
				I 0		O+	ho~					8	respons	es lo I	e sign	itttcar	IL	
				T 0		Ut	her					0						

?

0

Course-Section: CHEM 490 0101 University of Maryland Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN CHEM Baltimore County Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.

Spring 2009

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 393

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

					Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain	new insights, skills from	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1576	4.67	3.94	4.30	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instr	uctor make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.67	3.92	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam	questions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	658/1342	4.44	3.86	4.32	4.46	4.44
4. Did other eva		xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	719/1520	4.38	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.38
5. Did assigned	readings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1465	4.38	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.38
6. Did written a	ssignments contribute	to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	398/1434	4.50	3.75	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading	ng system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	755/1547	4.33	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times	s was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	355/1554	4.56	3.80	4.10	4.24	4.56
	Lecture															
1. Were the inst	ructor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.24	4.47	4.55	4.78
	uctor seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1493		4.43		4.80	5.00
	aterial presented and	_	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	619/1486		4.04	4.32	4.41	4.56
	res contribute to what	-	0	0	0	0	2	2		4.33			3.97		4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisu	al techniques enhance	your understanding	0	3	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	943/1277	3.67	3.72	4.03	4.04	3.67
	Discussion															
1. Did class dis	cussions contribute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.80	4.17	4.31	****
	ents actively encourage	_	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1270		3.91		4.53	****
	uctor encourage fair a		8	0	0	0	0	0			****/1269		3.73	4.35	4.55	***
	techniques successful	na open arroarron	8	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 878		3.88			***
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	_			Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	5

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 601 0101 University of Maryland Title CURRENT TOPICS IN CHEM Baltimore County Instructor: SUMMERS, MICHAE Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

8

University of Maryland Page 394
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

C+11don+	Comman	Erroluntion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

									Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	3			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General	 1																
1. т	Did von a	ain new	insights,ski	=	this course		0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	3.94	4.30	4.43	4.63
			or make clear				1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	728/1576	4.43	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.43
			stions reflect				1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	345/1342	4.71	3.86	4.32	4.38	4.71
			tions reflect				1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	291/1520	4.71	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.71
			dings contribu			ned	0	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.00
	_		gnments contr		-		1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1434	4.67	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.67
			system clearly		-		0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	445/1547	4.57	3.87	4.19	4.24	4.57
	_	_	as class cance	-			0	0	0	0	0	1	7		527/1574	4.88	4.76	4.64	4.75	4.88
9. I	How would	you gr	ade the overa	ll teach	ing effective	eness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554	4.86	3.80	4.10	4.18	4.86
		-			_															
			Lecture	2																
1. V	Were the	instruc	tor's lectures	s well p	repared		0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.88	4.24	4.47	4.52	4.88
2. I	Did the i	nstruct	or seem intere	ested in	the subject		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.43	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. V	Was lectu	re mate	rial presented	d and ex	plained clear	rly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.63
4. I	Did the l	ectures	contribute to	o what y	ou learned		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.97	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. I	Did audio	visual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understand	ling	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.72	4.03	4.08	5.00
			Discus																	
			sions contribu				2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	603/1279		3.80	4.17	4.34	
			s actively end				2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	3.91	4.35	4.53	4.67
			or encourage		open discuss	sion	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.60	3.73	4.35		4.60
4. V	Were spec	ial tec	hniques succes	ssful			2	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.11	4.33
						Freque	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Cred	dits Earn	ed	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	ades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-	 -27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8			Rec	quire	 -d fo	or Ma	aiors		0	Graduat		4	Majo	 r	1
28-		1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0			1000	quir	-u -v	J_ 110	. JOI:	_	Ü	Gradace	_	-	1100	/_	-
56-		0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0			Ger	neral	1				4	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	7
		0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														5	•
Gra		4	3.50-4.00	4	F 0			Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
				-	P 0										respons				_	,
					I 0			Oth	her					2			3			
					? 0															

Course-Section: CHEM 605L 0101

Title ADV INORG CHEM LAB

Instructor: DANIEL, MC (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 395 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

									ncies				ructor	Course	_		Level	
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	- 5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	l															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.92	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflec	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	3.86	4.32	4.38	4.75
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.75
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	5.00	3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00
				ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554		3.80	4.10		4.67
		Lecture	_															
1 Ware +	ho inata	Lecture actor's lecture:	_	nronarod	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.24	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ctor's lecture tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.24	4.47	4.52	5.00
						-							,					
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1486	5.00	4.04	4.32	4.37	5.00
		s contribute to			2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1489	5.00	3.97		4.38	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.72	4.03	4.08	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ate to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1269	5.00	3.73		4.55	5.00
		Labora																
				of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.36	5.00
				kground information	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.37	5.00
				for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.49	4.51	4.51	5.00
4. Did the	e lab ins	tructor provide	e assi:	stance	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.14	4.29	4.47	5.00
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.37	5.00
		Semina:	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t			e announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
	_	-		what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.70	5.00
				Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
				_														
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	_j h
				P 0									response				_	
				I O		0+1	her					1			5-			
				3 0		001						_						

Course-Section: CHEM 605L 0101 Title

ADV INORG CHEM LAB

Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 396 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	g.		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect
		Question	.s 		INIX.	NA				- 1		Mean	Ralik	меан	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.43	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	3.92	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	3.86	4.32	4.38	4.75
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.67
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.75
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1547	5.00	3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wor	uld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	623/1554	4.67	3.80	4.10	4.18	4.67
!!		Discus			_		_		•	•			4 /4 0 = 0				4 0 4	- 00
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	iair a	nd open discussion	3	U	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
		Labora	torv															
1 Did the	e lah ind		-	of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.36	5.00
			_	kground information	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 240	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.37	5.00
				for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 229	5.00	4.49	4.51	4.51	5.00
		structor provid			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 232	5.00	4.14	4.29	4.47	5.00
		_		learly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 379	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.37	5.00
	1			2 12 11														
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	e announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
3. Did rea	search pr	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.70	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	า									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pes	asons	2			Ту	ne.			Majors	
	arneu 									- 								
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a		enoug	h

Other

1

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Course-Section: CHEM 633 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOCHEM OF NUCLEIC ACI Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD

Enrollment:

3

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 397

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quescronnarres.	5	bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Quescionnai

			Fi	reque	ncie	g		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA		_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	C	0 0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1383/1576	3.67	3.94	4.30	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	C	0 0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1345/1576	3.67	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	C	0 0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1256/1342	3.33	3.86	4.32	4.38	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	C	0 (0	2	0	1	3.67	1300/1520	3.67	3.84	4.25	4.36	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	ed 0	C	0 (0	2	0	1	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	3.90	4.12	4.25	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lear	rned 0	C	0 0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1142/1434	3.67	3.75	4.14	4.35	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	C	0 0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1506/1547	2.67	3.87	4.19	4.24	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	C	0 0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective	ness 0	C	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1367/1554	3.33	3.80	4.10	4.18	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	C	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1368/1488	3.67	4.24	4.47	4.52	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	C	0	0	1	1	1		1411/1493		4.43	4.73	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	lv 0	C	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1375/1486	3.33	4.04	4.32	4.37	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	C	0	1	1	0	1		1363/1489		3.97	4.32	4.38	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi		C) 1	0	1	1	0		1219/1277		3.72	4.03	4.08	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	ed 1	C	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat		C	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	928/1270		3.91	4.35	4.53	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi		C		0	1	0	1	4.00	928/1269		3.73	4.35	4.55	4.00
Freq		y Di	istril	outio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	ades			Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	,
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		 F	 Requi	ed f	or Ma	aior	 S	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 r	1

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

Course-Section: CHEM 684 0101 University of Maryland SPEC TOPICS IN CHEMIST Baltimore County

Title JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation (Questionnaire

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

Page 398

Frequency Distribution

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

Title TECHNIQ NMR SPECTROSCO

Instructor: Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 399 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	500/1576	4.60	3.94	4.30	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.86	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.60	3.84	4.25	4.36	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	3.90	4.12	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.80	3.75	4.14	4.35	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	5.00	3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.76	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.17	3.80	4.10	4.18	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.50	4.24	4.47	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4 5	5.00		4.90		4.47		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493 1/1486	4.10	4.43	4.73	4.80 4.37	4.90 4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.10	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1277	4.70	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.70
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	2	3	4.00	250/12//	4.30	3.72	4.03	4.00	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.11	5.00
T a la anna la anna														
Laboratory	0	0	•	1	-	_	-1	2 60	006/004	2 60	4 00	4 00	4 26	2 60
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	1	2	1		206/ 234	3.60	4.22	4.23	4.36	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	215/ 240	3.80	4.38	4.35	4.37	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	185/ 229	4.25	4.49	4.51	4.51	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	1	2 1	1 1		200/ 232	3.60	4.14	4.29	4.47	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	U	3	U	U	U	1	Т	4.50	77/ 379	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.37	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.77	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.10	****
Field Work														
	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4 40	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.40	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****		4.76	****
	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.73 4.57	4.88 4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 326	****	3.45	4.03		***
3. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	4	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 326		3.45	4.03	4.10	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.50	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	4.13	****

Title TECHNIQ NMR SPECTROSCO

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 399 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

6 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Frequency Distribution

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

TECHNIQ NMR SPECTROSCO

YEH, DEOKCHEON (Instr. B)

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 400 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

TECHNIQ NMR SPECTROSCO

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

Baltimore County YEH, DEOKCHEON (Instr. B) Spring 2009

Page 400 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Frequency Distribution

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CHEM 690 0101

9

CHEMISTRY SEMINAR

LACOURSE, WILLI

Title

Grad.

2

3.50-4.00

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2009

Page 401

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions							FΥ	ewie.	ncies	4		Inct	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank		Mean		Mean	
		General	 1															
1 Did v	vou gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3 88	1266/1576	3.88	3.94	4.30	4.43	3.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	939/1576		3.92	4.27	4.32	4.25
		estions reflect			1	3	0	0	0	0	4		1/1342		3.86	4.32	4.38	5.00
	_	ations reflect	_	-	1	1	0	1	0	1	_	4.33			3.84		4.36	4.33
		eadings contribu	_	_	3	3	0	0	0	0	2		1/1465		3.90	4.12	4.25	5.00
				what you learned		2	0	0	0	0	4		1/1434		3.75	4.14	4.35	5.00
		g system clearly			. 0	1	0	0	0	0	7		1/1547		3.87	4.19	4.24	5.00
		was class cance		cu	2	0	0	0	0	0	-	5.00	1/1574				4.75	
	-			ng effectiveness		0	0	1	0	2			1166/1554			4.10	4.18	
	Lecture																	
1 Were	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.24	4.47	4.52	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	2		1053/1493		4.43	4.73	4.80	4.67
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1486		4.04	4.32	4.37	
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				6 5	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1489			4.32	4.38	5.00
				r understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1277		3.72	4.03	4.08	****
		-		_														
		Discus			_						_		4 /4 0 = 0	- 00		4 4 5		- 00
		ussions contribu		-	5	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1279	5.00	3.80	4.17	4.34	5.00
		nts actively end			5	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1270	5.00	3.91	4.35	4.53	5.00
		_		open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1269	5.00	3.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were	special to	echniques succes	sstul		5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.11	5.00
		Laborat	_															
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clea	rly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.24	4.20	4.37	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were	criteria 1	for grading made	e clear		7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.12	4.01	4.10	****
				Freq	uency	y Dis	trib	utio:	n									
G.,	Credita Formed Credita Firmested Credita							ъ.									No	
creaits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				; 			ке:	asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	r	7	
28-55																		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0				Ge	enera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	1		
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																		
- 1	•	0 = 0 4 00	•	_ ^								^						•

Electives

Other

0

6

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

I

?

0

3

0

0