

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 100 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>The Chemical World</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	632/1542	4.50	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	855/1542	4.31	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	775/1339	4.31	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	7	4	3.87	1182/1498	3.87	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1156/1428	3.67	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1144/1407	3.63	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	616/1521	4.44	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	1439/1541	4.06	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	7	2	3.82	1121/1518	3.82	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	568/1472	4.69	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1013/1475	4.69	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	513/1471	4.63	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	468/1470	4.69	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	186/1310	4.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1029/1210	3.44	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	1134/1211	3.33	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1086/1207	3.56	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 100 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>The Chemical World</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	10	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	7	16	10	3.89	1275/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	4	3	13	11	3.91	1208/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	5	3	11	14	4.03	970/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	5	7	10	7	3.66	1285/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	1	7	9	14	3.97	904/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	8	2	3	7	6	7	3.52	1198/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	2	6	8	14	3.85	1176/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	1	0	12	18	4.52	1116/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	2	8	8	7	3.80	1129/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	4	3	25	4.50	817/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	9	21	4.52	1189/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	740/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	11	16	4.32	897/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	2	5	10	12	4.10	706/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.41
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	6	9	10	3.73	934/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	3	3	8	16	4.23	809/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	8	8	12	4.00	918/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	3	7	7	10	3.69	636/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0 B 14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	7	16	10	3.89	1275/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	4	3	13	11	3.91	1208/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	5	3	11	14	4.03	970/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	5	7	10	7	3.66	1285/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	1	7	9	14	3.97	904/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	8	2	3	7	6	7	3.52	1198/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	2	6	8	14	3.85	1176/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	1	0	12	18	4.52	1116/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	2	1	11	4	3	3.24	1380/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	858/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1013/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	1083/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	1108/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	354/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.41
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	6	9	10	3.73	934/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	3	3	8	16	4.23	809/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	8	8	12	4.00	918/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	3	7	7	10	3.69	636/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 6	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 10	General 2	Under-grad 38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 38
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 8		

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Young,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	7	16	10	3.89	1275/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	4	3	13	11	3.91	1208/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	5	3	11	14	4.03	970/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	5	7	10	7	3.66	1285/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	1	7	9	14	3.97	904/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	8	2	3	7	6	7	3.52	1198/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	2	6	8	14	3.85	1176/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	1	0	12	18	4.52	1116/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	1	5	11	1	3.67	1213/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	912/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1256/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	809/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1208/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	2	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	300/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.41
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	6	9	10	3.73	934/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	3	3	8	16	4.23	809/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	8	8	12	4.00	918/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	3	7	7	10	3.69	636/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Young,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Young,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0 B 14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	7	16	10	3.89	1275/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	4	3	13	11	3.91	1208/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	5	3	11	14	4.03	970/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	5	7	10	7	3.66	1285/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	1	7	9	14	3.97	904/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	8	2	3	7	6	7	3.52	1198/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	2	6	8	14	3.85	1176/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	1	0	12	18	4.52	1116/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	2	4	12	1	3.63	1230/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	598/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1197/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	922/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1108/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	293/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.41
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	6	9	10	3.73	934/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	3	3	8	16	4.23	809/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	8	8	12	4.00	918/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	3	7	7	10	3.69	636/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0 B 14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	818/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	929/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	927/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1370/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1023/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1170/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1219/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1234/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	920/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	926/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1365/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1210/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	761/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	774/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1100/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	478/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	818/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	929/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	927/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1370/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1023/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1170/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1219/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1234/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1184/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	598/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	761/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	774/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1100/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	478/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	818/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	929/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	927/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1370/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1023/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1170/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1219/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1234/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	652/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	774/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1100/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	478/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	818/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	929/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	927/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1370/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1023/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1170/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1219/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1234/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	920/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	774/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1100/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	478/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	12	10	11	3.63	1399/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	14	13	3.89	1215/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	8	8	18	4.11	935/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	5	0	7	10	9	3.58	1315/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	3	7	10	11	3.68	1151/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	17	3	2	3	3	7	3.50	1210/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	6	9	15	3.81	1194/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	1	0	0	12	22	4.54	1093/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	1	7	12	7	3.93	1029/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	0	4	9	17	4.12	1176/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	2	0	5	4	23	4.35	1295/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	5	10	16	4.15	1023/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	3	1	4	6	18	4.09	1075/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	6	2	2	2	15	3.67	991/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	6	14	10	3.88	866/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	5	5	20	4.18	840/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	5	10	13	3.91	986/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	2	4	5	15	4.04	470/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.04

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	12	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	12	10	11	3.63	1399/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	14	13	3.89	1215/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	8	8	18	4.11	935/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	5	0	7	10	9	3.58	1315/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	3	7	10	11	3.68	1151/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	17	3	2	3	3	7	3.50	1210/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	6	9	15	3.81	1194/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	1	0	0	12	22	4.54	1093/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	3	4	15	2	3.56	1262/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	2	1	3	7	13	4.08	1199/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	2	0	2	5	17	4.35	1300/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	0	3	10	10	4.04	1087/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	2	5	4	11	3.83	1208/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	1	4	2	3	3	11	3.65	996/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	6	14	10	3.88	866/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	5	5	20	4.18	840/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	5	10	13	3.91	986/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	2	4	5	15	4.04	470/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.04

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	12	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Young,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	12	10	11	3.63	1399/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	14	13	3.89	1215/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	8	8	18	4.11	935/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	5	0	7	10	9	3.58	1315/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	3	7	10	11	3.68	1151/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	17	3	2	3	3	7	3.50	1210/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	6	9	15	3.81	1194/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	1	0	0	12	22	4.54	1093/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	2	7	9	3	3.62	1242/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	3	1	2	6	4	3.44	1409/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	2	0	4	3	7	3.81	1427/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	1155/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	0	5	3	4	3.33	1361/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	3	2	2	2	0	5	3.36	1129/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	6	14	10	3.88	866/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	5	5	20	4.18	840/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	5	10	13	3.91	986/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	2	4	5	15	4.04	470/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.04

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Young,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Young,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	12	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	12	10	11	3.63	1399/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	14	13	3.89	1215/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	8	8	18	4.11	935/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	5	0	7	10	9	3.58	1315/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	3	7	10	11	3.68	1151/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	17	3	2	3	3	7	3.50	1210/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	6	9	15	3.81	1194/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	1	0	0	12	22	4.54	1093/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	849/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	3	0	2	6	5	3.63	1380/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	1408/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	1078/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	0	4	3	5	3.47	1328/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	3	2	2	2	0	5	3.36	1129/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	6	14	10	3.88	866/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	5	5	20	4.18	840/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	5	10	13	3.91	986/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	2	4	5	15	4.04	470/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.04



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>39</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	12	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	15	11	4.13	1086/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	14	13	4.19	1009/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	6	12	13	4.23	849/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	3	7	6	9	3.84	1193/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	5	8	10	3.88	1000/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1210/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	6	8	14	4.21	892/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	985/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	1	1	8	5	10	3.88	1071/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	5	7	16	4.16	1148/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	7	4	18	4.27	1332/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	9	7	13	4.00	1104/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	5	11	11	3.93	1159/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	3	8	6	9	3.70	973/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	5	11	10	3.96	806/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	4	7	11	3.81	1021/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	2	10	10	3.81	1017/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	8	7	10	3.89	555/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	15	11	4.13	1086/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	14	13	4.19	1009/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	6	12	13	4.23	849/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	3	7	6	9	3.84	1193/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	5	8	10	3.88	1000/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1210/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	6	8	14	4.21	892/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	985/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	11	6	6	3.78	1141/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	1155/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1320/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1023/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	1082/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	1	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	963/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	5	11	10	3.96	806/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	4	7	11	3.81	1021/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	2	10	10	3.81	1017/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	8	7	10	3.89	555/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Major 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 6	General 3	Under-grad 33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 2		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 6		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	15	11	4.13	1086/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	14	13	4.19	1009/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	6	12	13	4.23	849/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	3	7	6	9	3.84	1193/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	5	8	10	3.88	1000/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1210/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	6	8	14	4.21	892/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	985/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	7	8	6	3.82	1121/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	766/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1173/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	607/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	740/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	1	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1020/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	5	11	10	3.96	806/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	4	7	11	3.81	1021/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	2	10	10	3.81	1017/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	8	7	10	3.89	555/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	6						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	15	11	4.13	1086/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	14	13	4.19	1009/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	6	12	13	4.23	849/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	3	7	6	9	3.84	1193/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	5	8	10	3.88	1000/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1210/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	6	8	14	4.21	892/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	985/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	588/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	885/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1105/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	696/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	660/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	2	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	875/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	5	11	10	3.96	806/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	4	7	11	3.81	1021/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	2	10	10	3.81	1017/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	8	7	10	3.89	555/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	6						

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	6	15	8	20	3.69	1375/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	13	14	19	3.88	1222/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	4	4	8	17	15	3.73	1137/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	13	3	1	10	12	9	3.66	1285/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	4	5	9	11	12	3.54	1219/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	1	11	6	5	3.44	1237/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	5	7	7	15	15	3.57	1299/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	16	29	4.61	1047/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	6	7	23	5	3.66	1219/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	0	5	16	24	4.28	1072/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	8	10	28	4.43	1248/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	4	5	13	23	4.15	1023/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	2	0	5	5	15	19	4.09	1075/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	5	6	10	18	3.98	791/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.65
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	3	11	10	10	3.32	1081/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	6	3	10	6	15	3.53	1096/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	5	11	9	11	3.39	1130/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	6	3	11	4	12	3.36	759/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.36

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Olson,Wendy J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 42	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 12	General 2	Under-grad 53 Non-major 51
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 1	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	6	15	8	20	3.69	1375/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	13	14	19	3.88	1222/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	4	4	8	17	15	3.73	1137/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	13	3	1	10	12	9	3.66	1285/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	4	5	9	11	12	3.54	1219/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	1	11	6	5	3.44	1237/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	5	7	7	15	15	3.57	1299/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	16	29	4.61	1047/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	3	4	16	9	2	3.09	1413/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	1	1	2	9	16	4.31	1042/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	1256/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	3	4	4	6	10	3.59	1310/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	6	1	4	8	7	3.35	1359/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	1	4	4	7	7	3.65	996/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.65
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	3	11	10	10	3.32	1081/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	6	3	10	6	15	3.53	1096/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	5	11	9	11	3.39	1130/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	6	3	11	4	12	3.36	759/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.36

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 42	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 12	General 2	Under-grad 53 Non-major 51
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 1	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	6	15	8	20	3.69	1375/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	13	14	19	3.88	1222/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	4	4	8	17	15	3.73	1137/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	13	3	1	10	12	9	3.66	1285/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	4	5	9	11	12	3.54	1219/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	1	11	6	5	3.44	1237/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	5	7	7	15	15	3.57	1299/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	16	29	4.61	1047/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	0	1	5	17	8	4.03	896/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	1099/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	1181/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	985/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	1037/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	3	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1113/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.65
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	3	11	10	10	3.32	1081/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	6	3	10	6	15	3.53	1096/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	5	11	9	11	3.39	1130/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	6	3	11	4	12	3.36	759/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.36

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 101 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 42	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 12	General 2	Under-grad 53 Non-major 51
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 1	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	6	15	8	20	3.69	1375/1542	3.94	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	13	14	19	3.88	1222/1542	4.02	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	4	4	8	17	15	3.73	1137/1339	4.04	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	13	3	1	10	12	9	3.66	1285/1498	3.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	4	5	9	11	12	3.54	1219/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	1	11	6	5	3.44	1237/1407	3.51	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	5	7	7	15	15	3.57	1299/1521	3.84	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	16	29	4.61	1047/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	2	2	5	17	5	3.68	1208/1518	3.79	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	2	1	2	5	10	4.00	1222/1472	4.25	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	1	1	2	4	13	4.29	1326/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	3	0	3	6	7	3.74	1254/1471	4.12	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	1	2	1	6	7	3.94	1152/1470	3.99	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	3	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1033/1310	3.85	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.65
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	7	3	11	10	10	3.32	1081/1210	3.78	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	6	3	10	6	15	3.53	1096/1211	3.85	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	5	11	9	11	3.39	1130/1207	3.82	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	6	3	11	4	12	3.36	759/859	3.80	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.36

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>53</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 42	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 12	General 2	Under-grad 53 Non-major 51
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 1	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	7	18	16	8	3.46	1443/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	10	20	12	3.68	1332/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	12	18	15	3.80	1111/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	6	9	8	6	3.40	1376/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	3	7	17	15	3.78	1075/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	2	0	7	6	4	3.53	1198/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	8	16	19	4.00	1046/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	1	15	30	4.57	1070/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	2	8	20	9	3.78	1141/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	3	5	10	26	4.20	1127/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	3	3	11	27	4.33	1305/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	4	3	4	19	14	3.82	1219/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	6	3	3	11	20	3.84	1208/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	4	0	9	16	11	3.75	948/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	12	1	11	9	8	3.00	1123/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	11	12	14	3.83	1018/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	8	11	10	8	3.30	1148/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	6	2	8	7	13	3.53	706/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.53

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 42	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 13	General 2	Under-grad 51 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	7	18	16	8	3.46	1443/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	10	20	12	3.68	1332/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	12	18	15	3.80	1111/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	6	9	8	6	3.40	1376/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	3	7	17	15	3.78	1075/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	2	0	7	6	4	3.53	1198/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	8	16	19	4.00	1046/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	1	15	30	4.57	1070/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	3	7	16	11	1	3.00	1425/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	4	2	6	13	4.00	1222/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	3	3	6	16	4.25	1335/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	5	7	7	5	3.50	1332/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	2	5	1	6	2	7	3.24	1380/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	8	3	2	2	5	5	3.41	1108/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	12	1	11	9	8	3.00	1123/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	11	12	14	3.83	1018/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	8	11	10	8	3.30	1148/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	6	2	8	7	13	3.53	706/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.53

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 42	Graduate 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		Major
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 13	General 2	Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	7	18	16	8	3.46	1443/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	10	20	12	3.68	1332/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	12	18	15	3.80	1111/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	6	9	8	6	3.40	1376/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	3	7	17	15	3.78	1075/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	2	0	7	6	4	3.53	1198/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	8	16	19	4.00	1046/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	1	15	30	4.57	1070/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	2	4	11	16	2	3.34	1352/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	3	2	5	8	3.84	1314/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	1275/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	1	4	1	3	8	3.76	1241/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	2	2	3	0	3	7	3.67	1268/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	8	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	12	1	11	9	8	3.00	1123/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	11	12	14	3.83	1018/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	8	11	10	8	3.30	1148/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	6	2	8	7	13	3.53	706/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.53

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 42	Graduate 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		Major
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 13	General 2	Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	7	18	16	8	3.46	1443/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	10	20	12	3.68	1332/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	12	18	15	3.80	1111/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	6	9	8	6	3.40	1376/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	3	7	17	15	3.78	1075/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	2	0	7	6	4	3.53	1198/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	8	16	19	4.00	1046/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	1	15	30	4.57	1070/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	1	8	15	11	4.03	904/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	674/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1126/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	961/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	1	2	2	1	10	4.06	1086/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	7	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	12	1	11	9	8	3.00	1123/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	11	12	14	3.83	1018/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	8	11	10	8	3.30	1148/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	6	2	8	7	13	3.53	706/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.53



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 42	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 13	General 2	Under-grad 51 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	7	3	3.25	1475/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	7	8	1	3.10	1492/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	5	6	0	2.74	1321/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	6	2	4	0	2.47	1486/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	1275/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	6	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1335/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1317/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1327/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	1	3	6	1	2.93	1440/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1323/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1413/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1267/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1343/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1141/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1165/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1120/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1198/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	7	3	3.25	1475/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	7	8	1	3.10	1492/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	5	6	0	2.74	1321/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	6	2	4	0	2.47	1486/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	1275/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	6	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1335/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1317/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1327/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	3	5	4	1	2.93	1440/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1422/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	5	1	2	3.33	1463/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1353/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1394/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1200/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1165/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1120/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1198/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	7	3	3.25	1475/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	7	8	1	3.10	1492/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	5	6	0	2.74	1321/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	6	2	4	0	2.47	1486/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	1275/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	6	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1335/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1317/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1327/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	744/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1311/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1397/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	922/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1201/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1141/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1165/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1120/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1198/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	7	3	3.25	1475/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	7	8	1	3.10	1492/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	5	6	0	2.74	1321/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	6	2	4	0	2.47	1486/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	1275/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	6	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1335/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1317/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1327/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	873/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1311/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1344/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	922/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1201/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1141/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1165/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1120/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1198/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	2	15	15	4.05	1138/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	13	19	4.30	879/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	11	17	4.08	950/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	2	5	6	12	4.00	1058/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	7	9	14	3.91	971/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	3	4	5	11	4.04	855/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	8	19	4.26	838/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	8	27	4.65	1011/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	9	9	14	4.06	873/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	5	26	4.56	753/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	8	26	4.64	1079/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	9	21	4.36	833/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	11	20	4.33	886/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	4	6	22	4.41	414/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.94
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	6	6	5	7	3.18	1109/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	863/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	2	7	3	13	3.85	1003/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.85

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	3	0	8	3	12	3.81	589/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.81

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 31	Graduate 0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Major 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 37
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	2	15	15	4.05	1138/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	13	19	4.30	879/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	11	17	4.08	950/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	2	5	6	12	4.00	1058/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	7	9	14	3.91	971/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	3	4	5	11	4.04	855/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	8	19	4.26	838/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	8	27	4.65	1011/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	6	13	6	4	3.06	1416/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	1	2	4	12	4.10	1193/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	2	3	3	3	12	3.87	1419/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	3	2	3	3	9	3.65	1287/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	2	5	1	2	2	7	3.29	1371/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	2	3	4	1	3	5	3.19	1189/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.94
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	6	6	5	7	3.18	1109/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	863/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	2	7	3	13	3.85	1003/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.85

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	3	0	8	3	12	3.81	589/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.81

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	2	15	15	4.05	1138/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	13	19	4.30	879/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	11	17	4.08	950/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	2	5	6	12	4.00	1058/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	7	9	14	3.91	971/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	3	4	5	11	4.04	855/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	8	19	4.26	838/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	8	27	4.65	1011/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	7	14	11	4.13	822/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	954/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	4	2	14	4.50	1197/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	696/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	934/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	1	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	761/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.94
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	6	6	5	7	3.18	1109/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	863/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	2	7	3	13	3.85	1003/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.85

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	3	0	8	3	12	3.81	589/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.81

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 7						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	2	15	15	4.05	1138/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	13	19	4.30	879/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	11	17	4.08	950/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	2	5	6	12	4.00	1058/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	7	9	14	3.91	971/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	3	4	5	11	4.04	855/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	8	19	4.26	838/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	8	27	4.65	1011/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	12	17	4.44	457/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	728/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	1053/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	894/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	865/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	1	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	658/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.94
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	6	6	5	7	3.18	1109/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	863/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	2	7	3	13	3.85	1003/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.85

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>38</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	3	0	8	3	12	3.81	589/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.81

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	10	16	4.31	895/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	8	16	4.29	879/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	8	15	4.00	982/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	1253/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	7	8	14	4.06	815/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1153/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	8	17	4.16	944/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	10	21	4.56	1077/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	6	10	9	3.86	1093/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	7	19	4.48	844/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	4	5	19	4.45	1241/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	12	12	4.24	953/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	8	15	4.17	1030/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	1	5	6	8	3.90	863/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	2	6	4	6	3.27	1091/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	3	7	1	10	3.73	1050/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	2	9	4	5	3.48	1106/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.48

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	3	2	6	2	7	3.40	745/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.40

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4 C 8	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	10	16	4.31	895/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	8	16	4.29	879/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	8	15	4.00	982/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	1253/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	7	8	14	4.06	815/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1153/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	8	17	4.16	944/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	10	21	4.56	1077/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	13	9	2	3.48	1293/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	1193/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	1358/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	1210/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	4	2	6	5	3.56	1303/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1165/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	2	6	4	6	3.27	1091/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	3	7	1	10	3.73	1050/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	2	9	4	5	3.48	1106/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.48

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	3	2	6	2	7	3.40	745/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.40

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4 C 8	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	10	16	4.31	895/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	8	16	4.29	879/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	8	15	4.00	982/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	1253/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	7	8	14	4.06	815/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1153/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	8	17	4.16	944/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	10	21	4.56	1077/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	9	8	5	3.67	1213/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1222/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	1351/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1332/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	2	1	4	4	3.46	1328/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	2	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1046/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	2	6	4	6	3.27	1091/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	3	7	1	10	3.73	1050/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	2	9	4	5	3.48	1106/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.48

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	3	2	6	2	7	3.40	745/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.40

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4 C 8	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 7						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	10	16	4.31	895/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	8	16	4.29	879/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	8	15	4.00	982/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	1253/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	7	8	14	4.06	815/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1153/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	8	17	4.16	944/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	10	21	4.56	1077/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	2	12	10	4.33	588/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	871/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	1173/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1015/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	1030/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	2	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	761/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	2	6	4	6	3.27	1091/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	3	7	1	10	3.73	1050/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	2	9	4	5	3.48	1106/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.48

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	3	2	6	2	7	3.40	745/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.40

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4 C 8	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	8	7	11	3.80	1315/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	9	5	12	3.77	1295/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	3	5	6	14	3.90	1054/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	1355/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	10	4	11	3.85	1023/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	2	2	6	5	5	3.45	1233/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	6	6	14	4.03	1031/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	0	1	8	19	4.40	1208/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	2	6	7	5	3.62	1242/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	6	5	17	4.28	1072/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	6	18	4.34	1300/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	5	7	13	3.97	1133/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	5	5	7	12	3.90	1185/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	4	3	2	6	10	3.60	1020/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	1	6	7	2	3.00	1123/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	1	5	12	4.14	863/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	0	6	5	6	3.55	1086/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	662/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 10		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		Non-major 33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 8	Other 0	

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	8	7	11	3.80	1315/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	9	5	12	3.77	1295/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	3	5	6	14	3.90	1054/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	1355/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	10	4	11	3.85	1023/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	2	2	6	5	5	3.45	1233/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	6	6	14	4.03	1031/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	0	1	8	19	4.40	1208/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	3	8	5	2	3.33	1354/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	1190/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	1295/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	2	1	3	8	6	3.75	1245/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	5	6	6	3.57	1297/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	3	2	2	4	6	3.47	1078/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	1	6	7	2	3.00	1123/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	1	5	12	4.14	863/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	0	6	5	6	3.55	1086/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	662/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 10		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		Non-major 33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 8		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	8	7	11	3.80	1315/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	9	5	12	3.77	1295/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	3	5	6	14	3.90	1054/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	1355/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	10	4	11	3.85	1023/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	2	2	6	5	5	3.45	1233/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	6	6	14	4.03	1031/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	0	1	8	19	4.40	1208/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	773/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	715/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1039/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	770/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1108/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	991/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	1	6	7	2	3.00	1123/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	1	5	12	4.14	863/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	0	6	5	6	3.55	1086/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	662/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 8		

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	8	7	11	3.80	1315/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	9	5	12	3.77	1295/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	3	5	6	14	3.90	1054/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	1355/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	10	4	11	3.85	1023/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	2	2	6	5	5	3.45	1233/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	6	6	14	4.03	1031/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	2	0	1	8	19	4.40	1208/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	0	7	5	5	3.88	1071/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	791/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	951/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	914/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1152/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	991/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	1	6	7	2	3.00	1123/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	1	5	12	4.14	863/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	0	6	5	6	3.55	1086/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	662/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	15	12	4.00	1173/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	8	11	12	3.94	1173/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	9	12	3.77	1120/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	4	8	6	7	3.64	1290/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	6	10	16	4.24	639/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	2	6	4	3	3.38	1265/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	7	7	16	4.16	944/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	836/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	13	11	5	3.58	1255/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	7	13	13	4.18	1134/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	3	12	15	4.29	1323/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	6	10	14	4.00	1104/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	8	8	14	4.10	1075/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	6	11	10	4.07	722/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	10	7	10	3.73	934/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	6	9	12	3.97	947/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	7	7	12	3.87	1000/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	3	7	3	9	3.58	685/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.58

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 36 Non-major 35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 10		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	15	12	4.00	1173/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	8	11	12	3.94	1173/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	9	12	3.77	1120/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	4	8	6	7	3.64	1290/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	6	10	16	4.24	639/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	2	6	4	3	3.38	1265/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	7	7	16	4.16	944/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	836/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	3	3	15	6	1	2.96	1433/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	2	2	9	11	4.08	1196/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	3	0	2	6	15	4.15	1368/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	2	1	5	7	8	3.78	1232/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	5	0	3	9	4	3.33	1361/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	2	2	2	6	6	3.67	991/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	10	7	10	3.73	934/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	6	9	12	3.97	947/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	7	7	12	3.87	1000/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	3	7	3	9	3.58	685/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.58

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 36 Non-major 35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 10		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	15	12	4.00	1173/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	8	11	12	3.94	1173/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	9	12	3.77	1120/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	4	8	6	7	3.64	1290/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	6	10	16	4.24	639/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	2	6	4	3	3.38	1265/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	7	7	16	4.16	944/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	836/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	6	13	8	3.96	974/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1281/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1234/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	821/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1167/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	977/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	10	7	10	3.73	934/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	6	9	12	3.97	947/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	7	7	12	3.87	1000/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	3	7	3	9	3.58	685/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.58

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ambuel,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 36
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Non-major 35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 10		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	15	12	4.00	1173/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	8	11	12	3.94	1173/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	9	12	3.77	1120/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	4	8	6	7	3.64	1290/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	6	10	16	4.24	639/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	2	6	4	3	3.38	1265/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	7	7	16	4.16	944/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	836/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	3	3	7	10	3	3.27	1372/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1199/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	1320/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	894/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1250/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	761/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	10	7	10	3.73	934/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	6	9	12	3.97	947/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	7	7	12	3.87	1000/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	3	7	3	9	3.58	685/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.58

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carbonaro,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 36
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Non-major 35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 10		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	13	21	4.38	818/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	16	20	4.38	787/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	14	22	4.45	638/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	7	8	12	4.19	926/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	9	10	17	4.16	725/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	19	1	0	7	4	6	3.78	1069/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	2	11	24	4.46	574/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	1	0	5	31	4.78	874/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	5	22	9	3.97	961/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.98
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	12	26	4.64	629/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	11	27	4.67	1039/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	7	14	18	4.28	922/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	6	28	4.54	660/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	1	4	13	15	4.27	556/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.26
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	4	16	14	4.05	757/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	5	25	4.35	723/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	7	8	18	4.03	912/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.03
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	2	6	23	4.56	195/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.56

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 34	Graduate 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Major 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		Non-major 43
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	13	21	4.38	818/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	16	20	4.38	787/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	14	22	4.45	638/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	7	8	12	4.19	926/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	9	10	17	4.16	725/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	19	1	0	7	4	6	3.78	1069/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	2	11	24	4.46	574/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	1	0	5	31	4.78	874/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	3	11	19	3	3.61	1242/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.98
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	0	7	16	4.58	715/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	1105/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	2	5	7	10	3.92	1163/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	2	3	2	15	4.22	993/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	0	1	5	2	12	4.25	576/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.26
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	4	16	14	4.05	757/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	5	25	4.35	723/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	7	8	18	4.03	912/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.03
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	2	6	23	4.56	195/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.56

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 34	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 43 Non-major 43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	13	21	4.38	818/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	16	20	4.38	787/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	14	22	4.45	638/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	7	8	12	4.19	926/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	9	10	17	4.16	725/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	19	1	0	7	4	6	3.78	1069/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	2	11	24	4.46	574/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	1	0	5	31	4.78	874/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	5	18	10	4.03	904/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.98
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	0	0	7	14	4.50	817/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	727/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	755/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	2	1	2	16	4.52	671/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	2	0	0	6	1	11	4.28	556/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.26
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	4	16	14	4.05	757/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	5	25	4.35	723/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	7	8	18	4.03	912/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.03
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	2	6	23	4.56	195/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.56

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 34	Graduate 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Major 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		Non-major 43
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	13	21	4.38	818/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	16	20	4.38	787/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	14	22	4.45	638/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	7	8	12	4.19	926/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	9	10	17	4.16	725/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	19	1	0	7	4	6	3.78	1069/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	2	11	24	4.46	574/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	1	0	5	31	4.78	874/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	3	18	13	4.29	640/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.98
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	435/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	897/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	463/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	498/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	2	0	0	6	1	10	4.24	596/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.26
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	4	16	14	4.05	757/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	4	5	25	4.35	723/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	7	8	18	4.03	912/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.03
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	2	6	23	4.56	195/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.56



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>White,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>43</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 34	Graduate 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Major 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		Non-major 43
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1504/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1504/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1325/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1483/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1263/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1349/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1470/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1387/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1460/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.48
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1419/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1424/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1410/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1405/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1141/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.11
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	924/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1100/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1172/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Carpenter,Tara</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1504/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1504/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1325/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1483/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1263/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1349/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1470/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1387/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1129/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.48
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	954/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1119/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1104/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	960/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	324/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.11
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	924/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1100/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1172/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1504/1542	3.81	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1504/1542	3.83	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1325/1339	3.71	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1483/1498	3.45	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1263/1428	3.86	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1349/1407	3.50	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1470/1521	3.96	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1387/1541	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1129/1518	3.69	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.48
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	954/1472	4.21	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1119/1475	4.36	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	985/1471	4.03	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	692/1470	3.90	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	324/1310	3.79	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.11
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	924/1210	3.34	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1100/1211	3.90	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1172/1207	3.49	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Of Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Audino,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.75	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	9	4	3.75	1343/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	9	3	3.65	1349/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	6	3	4	1	2.75	1320/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	2	5	8	1	3.22	1429/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1090/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	4	8	2	3.41	1251/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	7	3	4	3.10	1420/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	615/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.39
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	598/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	951/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	725/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	1065/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	5	9	4	3.94	822/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	739/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1142/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	165/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	147/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	102/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	119/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.06
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	9	4	3.75	1343/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	9	3	3.65	1349/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	6	3	4	1	2.75	1320/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	2	5	8	1	3.22	1429/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1090/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	4	8	2	3.41	1251/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	7	3	4	3.10	1420/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	3	5	4	1	0	2.23	1506/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.39
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	3	5	3	1	2.86	1454/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	1	4	3	4	3.43	1455/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	3	4	4	3	0	2.50	1454/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	3	3	0	2	2.21	1455/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	2	4	4	1	1	2.58	1279/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	739/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1142/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	165/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	147/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	102/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	119/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.06
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	9	4	3.75	1343/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	9	3	3.65	1349/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	6	3	4	1	2.75	1320/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	2	5	8	1	3.22	1429/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1090/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	4	8	2	3.41	1251/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	7	3	4	3.10	1420/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	3	8	1	3.62	1242/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.39
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1222/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1386/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	1062/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	1254/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	761/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.51
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	739/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1142/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	165/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	147/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	102/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	119/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.06
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	4	5	3	3.22	1480/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	3	5	3.61	1370/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	2	2	1	3	3.10	1285/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	5	3	3.35	1394/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	4	4	3.18	1332/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	3	3	2	3.08	1341/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	4	6	1	2	2.50	1496/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	865/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	674/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	727/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	969/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	6	5	3.65	1275/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	650/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1169/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1081/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1163/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	*****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	6	3	3	3.50	180/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	174/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	165/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.21
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	186/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	171/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	4	5	3	3.22	1480/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	3	5	3.61	1370/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	2	2	1	3	3.10	1285/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	5	3	3.35	1394/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	4	4	3.18	1332/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	3	3	2	3.08	1341/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	4	6	1	2	2.50	1496/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	2	4	3	0	1	2.40	1497/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	4	2	2	3	3.17	1427/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1443/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	3	2	5	2	0	2.50	1454/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	3	2	3	1	2	2.73	1437/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	4	1	1	2	2	2.70	1267/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1169/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1081/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1163/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	6	3	3	3.50	180/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	174/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	165/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.21
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	186/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	171/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,E.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	4	5	3	3.22	1480/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	3	5	3.61	1370/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	2	2	1	3	3.10	1285/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	5	3	3.35	1394/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	4	4	3.18	1332/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	3	3	2	3.08	1341/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	4	6	1	2	2.50	1496/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	5	1	4	3.38	1342/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	7	1	1	3.10	1432/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1447/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1410/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	2	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1438/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	1	1	4	0	1	2.86	1252/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1169/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1081/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1163/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,E.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	6	3	3	3.50	180/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	174/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	165/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.21
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	186/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	171/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,E.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	5	7	6	0	2.95	1514/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	5	8	2	3.20	1480/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	3	2	4	1	1	2.55	1331/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	2	7	3	4	3.28	1419/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	4	6	3	3.41	1259/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1302/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	10	2	3	2	1	2.00	1509/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	920/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	0	6	10	4.16	1155/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	1013/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	969/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	3	4	7	3.76	1233/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1113/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.03
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1184/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	7	7	0	3.25	189/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	154/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	181/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.06
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	161/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	2	2	6	4	3.50	164/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	5	7	6	0	2.95	1514/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	5	8	2	3.20	1480/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	3	2	4	1	1	2.55	1331/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	2	7	3	4	3.28	1419/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	4	6	3	3.41	1259/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1302/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	10	2	3	2	1	2.00	1509/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	3	5	5	2	0	2.40	1497/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	2	7	1	4	3.06	1435/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	6	2	7	3.82	1425/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	4	6	2	1	2.63	1449/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	7	1	5	0	2	2.27	1452/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	3	3	3	1	2	2.67	1271/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.03
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1184/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	7	7	0	3.25	189/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	154/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	181/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.06
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	161/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	2	2	6	4	3.50	164/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	5	7	6	0	2.95	1514/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	5	8	2	3.20	1480/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	3	2	4	1	1	2.55	1331/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	2	7	3	4	3.28	1419/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	4	6	3	3.41	1259/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1302/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	10	2	3	2	1	2.00	1509/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	5	8	1	3.44	1320/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1380/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	2	9	1	3.77	1432/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1295/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1318/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.03
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1184/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	7	7	0	3.25	189/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	154/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	181/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.06
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	161/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	2	2	6	4	3.50	164/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	6	4	3.48	1440/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	7	5	3	3.24	1474/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	7	5	1	2	2.56	1330/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	2	6	5	2	2.95	1464/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1352/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	3	2	6	1	2.93	1363/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	6	3	6	3.47	1340/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1085/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.37
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	1148/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	1315/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1083/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	5	3	3	8	3.74	1243/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	4	4	2	2	3.00	1218/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1142/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	*****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	121/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	160/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	81/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	89/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	6	4	3.48	1440/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	7	5	3	3.24	1474/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	7	5	1	2	2.56	1330/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	2	6	5	2	2.95	1464/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1352/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	3	2	6	1	2.93	1363/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	6	3	6	3.47	1340/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	5	3	1	0	2.40	1497/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.37
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1380/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1197/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	1449/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1441/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	1	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	****/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1142/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	121/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	160/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	81/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	89/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	6	4	3.48	1440/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	7	5	3	3.24	1474/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	7	5	1	2	2.56	1330/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	2.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	2	6	5	2	2.95	1464/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	2.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1352/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	3	2	6	1	2.93	1363/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	6	3	6	3.47	1340/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1100/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.37
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1065/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1397/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1015/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1318/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1142/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	121/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	160/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	81/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	89/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	9	3	4	3.00	1504/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	6	7	3.58	1382/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	0	7	2	4	3.25	1272/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	3	4	7	5	3.60	1308/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	5	7	4	3.38	1271/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	8	2	5	3.20	1309/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	7	5	3	3	2.65	1487/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	22	4.87	754/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	12	2	4.07	873/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	817/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	897/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	770/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	0	3	5	11	3.95	1145/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	0	5	3	8	3.55	1042/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.26
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1007/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1066/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1097/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	2	2	3	6	6	3.63	174/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	1	4	7	6	3.70	170/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	136/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	1	5	10	3.95	157/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	4	9	5	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	5	9	3	4	3.00	1504/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	6	7	3.58	1382/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	0	7	2	4	3.25	1272/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	3	4	7	5	3.60	1308/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	5	7	4	3.38	1271/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	8	2	5	3.20	1309/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	7	5	3	3	2.65	1487/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	22	4.87	754/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	4	5	4	1	0	2.14	1510/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	2	4	6	5	3.18	1426/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	2	5	5	7	3.50	1447/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	11	3	2	3	3	2.27	1462/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	4	10	1	3	2	2	2.17	1457/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	3	2	7	1	2	2.80	1258/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.26
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1007/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1066/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1097/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	2	2	3	6	6	3.63	174/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	1	4	7	6	3.70	170/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	136/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	1	5	10	3.95	157/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	4	9	5	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Major 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	5	9	3	4	3.00	1504/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	6	7	3.58	1382/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	0	7	2	4	3.25	1272/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	3	4	7	5	3.60	1308/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	5	7	4	3.38	1271/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	8	2	5	3.20	1309/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	7	5	3	3	2.65	1487/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	22	4.87	754/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	6	7	1	3.47	1304/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1317/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	1368/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	1236/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	3	3	0	1	4	6	3.71	1250/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1093/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.26
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1007/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1066/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1097/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	2	2	3	6	6	3.63	174/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	1	4	7	6	3.70	170/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	136/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	1	5	10	3.95	157/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	4	9	5	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	7	8	5	3.58	1415/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	11	7	6	3.79	1282/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	7	4	3	3.35	1251/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	5	5	6	3.55	1327/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	4	8	7	3.78	1075/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	933/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	6	4	4	2.83	1465/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	12	4	4.11	832/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.64
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	817/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	619/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	637/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	9	8	4.04	1093/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	9	6	3.86	893/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.64
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1156/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1130/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1113/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	315/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	92/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.28
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	49/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	52/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	89/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	7	8	5	3.58	1415/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	11	7	6	3.79	1282/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	7	4	3	3.35	1251/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	5	5	6	3.55	1327/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	4	8	7	3.78	1075/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	933/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	6	4	4	2.83	1465/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	12	2	1	3.06	1418/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.64
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	5	10	4	3.57	1390/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	6	3	13	4.17	1361/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	5	9	4	3	3.04	1407/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	6	4	6	4	3.18	1388/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	4	7	5	4	3.45	1088/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.64
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1156/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1130/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1113/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	315/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	92/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.28
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	49/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	52/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	89/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	7	8	5	3.58	1415/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	11	7	6	3.79	1282/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	7	4	3	3.35	1251/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	5	5	6	3.55	1327/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	4	8	7	3.78	1075/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	933/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	6	4	4	2.83	1465/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	6	8	2	3.75	1160/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.64
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1086/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	1219/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	1054/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	1201/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1010/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.64
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1156/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1130/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1113/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	315/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	4.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	92/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.28
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	49/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	52/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	139/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	89/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	805/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	833/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1168/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	524/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	681/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	717/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	7	8	3.90	1139/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	481/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	367/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	673/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	346/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	865/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	2	4	11	4.16	666/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.09
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	46/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	30/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	29/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	23/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	47/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.63

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 1	B 4		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	805/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	833/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1168/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	524/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	681/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	717/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	7	8	3.90	1139/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	7	7	0	1	2.67	1479/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	5	6	6	3.89	1302/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	1344/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	3	7	2	3	2.94	1423/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	3	3	2	5	2.94	1415/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	917/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.09
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	46/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	30/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	29/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	23/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	47/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.63

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 1	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other 0		
			? 2			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	805/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	833/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1168/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	524/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	681/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	717/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	7	8	3.90	1139/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	686/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	817/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	897/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	438/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	886/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	526/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.09
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	46/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	30/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	29/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	23/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	47/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.63

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 1	B 4		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1359/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1359/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	2	0	0	4	2	3.50	1212/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	1	6	1	3.36	1390/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	0	3	3	3.40	1263/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1326/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1378/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	686/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	598/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	764/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	231/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.97
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1359/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1359/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	2	0	0	4	2	3.50	1212/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	1	6	1	3.36	1390/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	0	3	3	3.40	1263/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1326/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1378/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	3	3	1	0	2.71	1475/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1424/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1416/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	2	1	3	3.44	1348/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1351/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1010/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.97
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,E.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1359/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1359/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	2	0	0	4	2	3.50	1212/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	1	6	1	3.36	1390/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	0	3	3	3.40	1263/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1326/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1378/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	920/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1176/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1241/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1046/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1193/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	991/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.97
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sesmero,E.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1493/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1122/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1276/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1423/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1263/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1304/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1460/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	802/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1183/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	1344/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1046/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1351/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1020/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	150/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	129/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	116/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	74/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1493/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1122/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1276/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1423/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1263/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1304/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1460/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1460/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1429/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1463/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1283/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1440/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1218/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	150/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	129/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	116/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	74/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1493/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1122/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1276/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1423/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1263/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1304/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1460/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	534/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1086/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1429/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1104/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1318/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1218/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	150/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	129/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	116/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	74/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	869/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	904/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1198/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1058/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1015/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	5	2	6	3.53	1322/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	421/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	503/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	861/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	637/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1090/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	761/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	60/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	76/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	37/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	56/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	45/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.64
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	869/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	904/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1198/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1058/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1015/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	5	2	6	3.53	1322/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	6	1	3	3.15	1400/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	1199/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	1372/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	2	4	2	2	2.71	1442/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	2	3	1	2	2.46	1447/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	3	2	5	2	1	2.69	1268/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	60/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	76/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	37/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	56/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	45/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.64
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	869/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	904/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1198/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1058/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1015/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	5	2	6	3.53	1322/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	709/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	861/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	567/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	934/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	495/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	60/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	76/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	37/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	56/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	45/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.64
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sundaram,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	8	4.13	1077/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	9	8	3.96	1165/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	7	5	4	3.56	1198/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	4	3	6	6	3.74	1248/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	9	6	3.86	1023/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	10	6	3.90	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	1006/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	548/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.88
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	503/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	861/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	577/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	8	6	3.84	1204/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	690/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1007/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1001/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	886/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	2	9	6	3.89	142/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	0	1	7	9	4.11	131/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	113/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	89/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	0	8	9	4.21	99/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.21
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	8	4.13	1077/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	9	8	3.96	1165/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	7	5	4	3.56	1198/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	4	3	6	6	3.74	1248/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	9	6	3.86	1023/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	10	6	3.90	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	1006/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	3	6	6	1	3.06	1418/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.88
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	1	5	11	4.00	1222/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	3	2	14	4.24	1341/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	3	3	6	5	3.24	1387/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	3	4	2	1	6	4	3.24	1380/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1213/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1007/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1001/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	886/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	2	9	6	3.89	142/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	0	1	7	9	4.11	131/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	113/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	89/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	0	8	9	4.21	99/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.21
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	8	4.13	1077/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	9	8	3.96	1165/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	7	5	4	3.56	1198/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	4	3	6	6	3.74	1248/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	9	6	3.86	1023/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	10	6	3.90	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	1006/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	721/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.88
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	486/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	933/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	500/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	2	0	0	6	8	4.13	1058/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	875/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1007/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1001/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	886/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	2	9	6	3.89	142/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	0	1	7	9	4.11	131/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	113/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	89/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	0	8	9	4.21	99/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.21
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kohnhorst,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1086/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	929/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1093/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	767/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1275/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1102/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1331/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	783/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1106/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	861/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	587/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	692/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	606/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.30
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1123/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1155/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	836/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	2.67



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	161/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	79/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	136/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	121/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	122/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1086/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	929/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1093/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	767/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1275/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1102/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1331/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1425/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1380/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1433/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1332/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1108/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	761/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.30
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1123/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1155/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	836/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	2.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	161/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	79/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	136/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	121/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	122/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1086/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	929/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1093/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	767/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1275/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1102/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1331/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1093/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1065/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	969/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	755/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	886/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	201/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.30
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1123/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1155/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	836/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	2.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	161/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	79/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	136/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	121/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	122/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	10	2	3.43	1454/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	7	4	3.52	1400/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	7	2	0	3.10	1285/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	10	4	2	3.26	1421/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1090/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1192/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	7	7	1	1	2.47	1498/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	787/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	12	5	4.22	721/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.19
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	690/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	987/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	785/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	5	8	3.85	1201/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	5	3	8	3.83	905/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.41
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	177/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	7	2	4	3.57	179/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	188/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	3.93
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	1	1	4	6	1	3.38	187/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	2	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	10	2	3.43	1454/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	7	4	3.52	1400/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	7	2	0	3.10	1285/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	10	4	2	3.26	1421/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1090/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1192/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	7	7	1	1	2.47	1498/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	787/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	3	5	9	1	0	2.44	1493/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.19
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	5	4	5	2	3.12	1431/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	3	6	7	2	3.44	1453/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	5	7	2	1	2.61	1450/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	7	2	7	1	1	2.28	1451/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	3	5	4	1	2.81	1256/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.41
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	177/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	7	2	4	3.57	179/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	188/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	3.93
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	1	1	4	6	1	3.38	187/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	2	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Santhanam,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	10	2	3.43	1454/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	7	4	3.52	1400/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	7	2	0	3.10	1285/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	10	4	2	3.26	1421/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1090/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1192/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	7	7	1	1	2.47	1498/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	2.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	787/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	4	10	4	0	2.89	1448/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.19
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	2	5	2	2	3.36	1417/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	7	2	1	3.18	1467/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1410/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	5	2	0	2.55	1444/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1033/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.41
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 14</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Santhanam,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	177/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	7	2	4	3.57	179/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	188/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	3.93
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	1	1	4	6	1	3.38	187/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	2	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	7	10	4.04	1145/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	712/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1088/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	5	8	6	3.81	1216/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	6	5	6	3.68	1145/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	3	8	8	3.86	1163/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	345/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	469/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.96
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	690/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	619/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	538/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	5	12	4.23	985/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	596/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.11
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	884/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1097/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	100/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.24
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	81/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	17/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	39/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 24	Non-major 23
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 responses to be significant	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other 0		
			? 2			



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	7	10	4.04	1145/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	712/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1088/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	5	8	6	3.81	1216/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	6	5	6	3.68	1145/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	3	8	8	3.86	1163/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	345/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	2	4	7	1	2	2.81	1464/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.96
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	7	3	7	3.52	1396/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	3	8	8	3.86	1419/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	6	5	3	3	2.68	1444/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	5	2	4	2	6	3.11	1401/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	2	5	7	3	3.37	1129/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.11
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	884/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1097/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	100/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.24
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	81/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	17/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	39/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	21	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	2	Under-grad 24	Non-major 23
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 responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	0		
			? 2				

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Varma,R.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	7	10	4.04	1145/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	712/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1088/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	5	8	6	3.81	1216/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	6	5	6	3.68	1145/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	973/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	3	8	8	3.86	1163/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	345/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	269/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.96
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	452/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	323/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	438/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	728/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	158/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.11
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	884/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1159/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1097/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Varma,R.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	100/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.24
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	81/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	17/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	39/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
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 responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	951/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	1035/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1054/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	822/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	1007/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	599/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	6	4	5	3.53	1322/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	675/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.86
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	568/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	323/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	637/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1051/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	698/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.93
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	90/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	69/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	39/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	61/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.50

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	951/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	1035/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1054/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	822/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	1007/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	599/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	6	4	5	3.53	1322/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	1	5	4	2	1	2.77	1470/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.86
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	7	3	4	3.67	1370/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1432/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	6	4	1	2	2.79	1438/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	2	2	3	3	2	1	2.73	1437/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1189/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.93
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	90/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	69/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	39/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	61/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.50

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Varma,R.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	951/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	1035/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1054/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	822/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	1007/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	599/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	6	4	5	3.53	1322/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	349/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.86
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	303/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	727/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	770/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	692/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	324/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.93
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Varma,R.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	90/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	73/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	69/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	39/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	61/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.50

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate 0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 5					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	2	Under-grad 21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	0			
			? 4					

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 18</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	7	3	3.50	1432/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	6	7	3.73	1313/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	6	3	5	3.37	1249/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1338/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	3	7	3.68	1145/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	874/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	7	4	6	3	3.05	1428/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	663/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	520/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	879/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	399/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	907/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	832/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 18</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	4	8	3	3.71	170/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	138/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	154/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	144/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.06
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	3	4	4	6	3.76	148/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.76

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 18</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	7	3	3.50	1432/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	6	7	3.73	1313/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	6	3	5	3.37	1249/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1338/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	3	7	3.68	1145/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	874/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	7	4	6	3	3.05	1428/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	9	3	1	3.06	1416/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	8	8	4.11	1190/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	3	1	7	7	3.84	1422/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	2	3	7	4	3.37	1367/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	6	5	5	3.61	1285/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	4	4	3	2	3.23	1174/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 18</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	4	8	3	3.71	170/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	138/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	154/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	144/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.06
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	3	4	4	6	3.76	148/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.76

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 18</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Santhanam,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	7	3	3.50	1432/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	6	7	3.73	1313/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	6	3	5	3.37	1249/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1338/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	3	7	3.68	1145/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	874/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	7	4	6	3	3.05	1428/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	6	6	1	3.25	1375/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	1266/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	5	3	5	4	3.33	1463/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1236/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1289/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1103/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 18</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Santhanam,N.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	4	8	3	3.71	170/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	138/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	154/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	144/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.06
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	3	4	4	6	3.76	148/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.76

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 24</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1421/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1420/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1256/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1455/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1340/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1389/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	2.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1157/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	994/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	588/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.51
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	983/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	1285/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	346/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1058/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	658/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	739/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	769/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	646/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 24</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	195/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	184/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	89/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 24</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1421/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1420/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1256/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1455/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1340/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1389/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	2.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1157/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	994/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1497/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.51
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1439/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	1474/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1410/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1429/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1218/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	739/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	769/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	646/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 24</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	195/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	184/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	89/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 24</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1421/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1420/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1256/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1455/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1340/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1389/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	2.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1157/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	994/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1129/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.51
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	3.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	739/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	769/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	646/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 24</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	195/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	184/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	89/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	150/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.75

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	780/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1122/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1185/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1058/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	181/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	518/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1283/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.42
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	817/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	808/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1104/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	140/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.47
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	966/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	121/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	38/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	51/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.60
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	5.00
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	5.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	780/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1122/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1185/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1058/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	181/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	518/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1471/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.42
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1414/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1351/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1359/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1343/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	991/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.47
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	966/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	121/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	38/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	51/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.60
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	5.00
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Weidlick,I.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	780/1542	3.72	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1122/1542	3.82	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1185/1339	3.33	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1058/1498	3.61	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	181/1428	3.64	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1407	3.61	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	518/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.96	4.82	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	920/1518	3.58	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.42
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1222/1472	4.04	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1335/1475	4.25	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1104/1471	3.81	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1470	3.59	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1310	3.69	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.47
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	966/1210	3.26	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	3.81	3.94	4.37	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1207	3.70	3.83	4.41	4.12	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	3.56	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	121/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	38/210	4.12	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/202	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/202	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	51/199	4.14	4.06	4.15	4.14	4.60
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.27	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.28	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.15	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.22	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/35	5.00	5.00	4.36	5.00	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	5.00	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/23	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/17	5.00	5.00	4.62	5.00	5.00
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/19	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.84	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/29	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.82	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 102L 26</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>DeTorres,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/18	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.80	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/13	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.77	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic &amp; Biochem II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	285/1542	4.79	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	169/1542	4.88	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	215/1339	4.84	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	0	5	18	4.63	404/1498	4.63	3.80	4.26	4.08	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	301/1428	4.60	3.83	4.12	3.98	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	662/1407	4.27	3.74	4.15	3.92	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	203/1521	4.79	3.85	4.20	4.09	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	26	3	3.97	1474/1541	3.97	4.82	4.70	4.66	3.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	77/1518	4.93	3.75	4.11	4.00	4.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	146/1472	4.94	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	215/1475	4.97	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	114/1471	4.94	3.98	4.32	4.23	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	177/1470	4.91	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	717/1310	4.08	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.08
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.12	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 124 1	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 56
<b>Title:</b> Gen Organic & Biochem II		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 34
<b>Instructor:</b> Tracy,Allison M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	30	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	6	6	6	4.00	1173/1542	4.17	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	6	9	3	3.83	1257/1542	3.88	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	8	5	4	3.67	1160/1339	3.91	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	3	7	4	2	3.18	1437/1498	3.39	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1168/1428	3.58	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	1117/1407	3.64	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	8	1	3.21	1398/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1286/1541	4.41	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	12	1	3.82	1114/1518	3.25	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.22
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	899/1472	3.91	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	861/1475	4.23	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	1015/1471	3.60	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	985/1470	3.54	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	728/1310	4.14	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.06
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1045/1210	3.66	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1081/1211	3.62	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1021/1207	3.94	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/859	3.13	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	121/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	150/210	3.77	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	153/202	4.34	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	192/202	3.12	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	167/199	3.49	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.46
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	6	6	6	4.00	1173/1542	4.17	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	6	9	3	3.83	1257/1542	3.88	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	8	5	4	3.67	1160/1339	3.91	3.81	4.32	4.14	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	3	7	4	2	3.18	1437/1498	3.39	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1168/1428	3.58	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	1117/1407	3.64	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	8	1	3.21	1398/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1286/1541	4.41	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	4	7	1	0	2.62	1484/1518	3.25	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.22
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1431/1472	3.91	4.23	4.46	4.38	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1429/1475	4.23	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	3	3	3	0	2.80	1437/1471	3.60	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1399/1470	3.54	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1310	4.14	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.06
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1045/1210	3.66	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1081/1211	3.62	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1021/1207	3.94	3.83	4.41	4.12	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/859	3.13	3.76	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	121/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	150/210	3.77	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	153/202	4.34	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	192/202	3.12	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	167/199	3.49	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.46
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 7		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	11	12	4.35	856/1542	4.17	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	10	8	3.93	1190/1542	3.88	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	9	12	4.15	911/1339	3.91	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	9	8	4	3.61	1308/1498	3.39	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	2	5	10	4	3.52	1223/1428	3.58	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	7	8	6	3.60	1153/1407	3.64	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	6	10	5	5	3.35	1376/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	13	4.50	1124/1541	4.41	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	6	11	6	4.00	920/1518	3.25	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	753/1472	3.91	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	430/1475	4.23	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	567/1471	3.60	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	12	11	4.27	951/1470	3.54	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	2	8	12	4.21	626/1310	4.14	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	838/1210	3.66	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	0	3	5	4	3.64	1071/1211	3.62	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	899/1207	3.94	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	809/859	3.13	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.13



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	2	6	7	7	3.74	167/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.74
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	5	4	9	5	3.61	178/210	3.77	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.61
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	11	11	4.38	141/202	4.34	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	6	4	4	4	6	3.00	194/202	3.12	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	3	4	9	5	3.52	163/199	3.49	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.52
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tyminski, Frank</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	11	12	4.35	856/1542	4.17	3.97	4.33	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	10	8	3.93	1190/1542	3.88	4.00	4.29	4.23	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	9	12	4.15	911/1339	3.91	3.81	4.32	4.14	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	9	8	4	3.61	1308/1498	3.39	3.80	4.26	4.08	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	2	5	10	4	3.52	1223/1428	3.58	3.83	4.12	3.98	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	7	8	6	3.60	1153/1407	3.64	3.74	4.15	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	6	10	5	5	3.35	1376/1521	3.28	3.85	4.20	4.09	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	13	4.50	1124/1541	4.41	4.82	4.70	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	5	2	7	4	0	2.56	1487/1518	3.25	3.75	4.11	4.00	3.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	2	2	2	4	5	3.53	1394/1472	3.91	4.23	4.46	4.38	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	4	3	2	5	3.40	1457/1475	4.23	4.41	4.72	4.63	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	3	2	3	6	0	2.86	1434/1471	3.60	3.98	4.32	4.23	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	4	3	2	3	1	2.54	1444/1470	3.54	3.89	4.33	4.21	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	10	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1310	4.14	3.81	4.06	3.93	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	838/1210	3.66	3.53	4.18	3.91	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	0	3	5	4	3.64	1071/1211	3.62	3.94	4.37	4.15	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	899/1207	3.94	3.83	4.41	4.12	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	809/859	3.13	3.76	4.08	3.95	3.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	2	6	7	7	3.74	167/207	3.87	4.04	4.12	3.92	3.74
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	5	4	9	5	3.61	178/210	3.77	4.14	4.17	4.14	3.61
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	11	11	4.38	141/202	4.34	4.53	4.50	4.49	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	6	4	4	4	6	3.00	194/202	3.12	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	3	4	9	5	3.52	163/199	3.49	4.06	4.15	4.14	3.52
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/67	****	****	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 124L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Gen Organic Biochem Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	11	3.96	1209/1542	3.93	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	11	9	3.78	1291/1542	3.94	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	6	14	4.04	970/1339	4.17	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	1007/1498	3.99	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	8	10	3.85	1030/1428	3.90	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	1	2	7	8	3.64	1139/1407	3.59	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	1	7	11	3.59	1290/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	3	3	7	8	3.70	1196/1518	3.64	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	0	4	3	16	4.00	1222/1472	4.07	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	1	0	7	17	4.33	1305/1475	4.24	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	2	9	9	3.63	1299/1471	3.89	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	3	6	12	3.70	1254/1470	3.82	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	5	0	3	4	7	3.42	1103/1310	3.23	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.09
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	8	11	3.96	806/1210	3.65	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	5	5	12	3.96	947/1211	4.23	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	6	5	10	3.76	1034/1207	3.77	3.83	4.41	4.51	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	3	1	3	7	7	3.67	646/859	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 3		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 34				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 27				
Instructor: Mang, Stephen A.														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	6	7	10	3.85	152/207	3.99	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	101/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	2	0	0	6	18	4.46	116/202	4.63	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	2	3	8	11	3.92	163/202	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	5	5	1	9	6	3.23	190/199	3.48	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.23
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	4.17	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	2.17	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	1.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 6
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 9		

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	11	3.96	1209/1542	3.93	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	11	9	3.78	1291/1542	3.94	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	6	14	4.04	970/1339	4.17	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	1007/1498	3.99	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	8	10	3.85	1030/1428	3.90	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	1	2	7	8	3.64	1139/1407	3.59	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	1	7	11	3.59	1290/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	1	14	3	1	2.91	1447/1518	3.64	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	6	4	8	3.95	1266/1472	4.07	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	6	3	10	4.05	1391/1475	4.24	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	4	6	2	5	3.33	1373/1471	3.89	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	6	1	7	3.50	1318/1470	3.82	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	1258/1310	3.23	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.09
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	8	11	3.96	806/1210	3.65	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	5	5	12	3.96	947/1211	4.23	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	6	5	10	3.76	1034/1207	3.77	3.83	4.41	4.51	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	3	1	3	7	7	3.67	646/859	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 3		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 34				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 27				
Instructor: Hamilton,Diana														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	6	7	10	3.85	152/207	3.99	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	101/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	2	0	0	6	18	4.46	116/202	4.63	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	2	3	8	11	3.92	163/202	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	5	5	1	9	6	3.23	190/199	3.48	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.23
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	4.17	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	2.17	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	1.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	11	3.96	1209/1542	3.93	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	11	9	3.78	1291/1542	3.94	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	6	14	4.04	970/1339	4.17	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	1007/1498	3.99	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	8	10	3.85	1030/1428	3.90	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	1	2	7	8	3.64	1139/1407	3.59	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	1	7	11	3.59	1290/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	10	6	3.87	1085/1518	3.64	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1162/1472	4.07	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1197/1475	4.24	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1074/1471	3.89	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	6	1	4	3.58	1294/1470	3.82	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1200/1310	3.23	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.09
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	8	11	3.96	806/1210	3.65	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	5	5	12	3.96	947/1211	4.23	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	6	5	10	3.76	1034/1207	3.77	3.83	4.41	4.51	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	3	1	3	7	7	3.67	646/859	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 300 3		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 34				
Title: Analytical Chemistry										Questionnaires: 27				
Instructor: Bass,S.														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	6	7	10	3.85	152/207	3.99	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	101/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	2	0	0	6	18	4.46	116/202	4.63	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	2	3	8	11	3.92	163/202	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	5	5	1	9	6	3.23	190/199	3.48	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.23
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	4.17	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	2.17	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	1.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gray,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	11	3.96	1209/1542	3.93	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	11	9	3.78	1291/1542	3.94	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	6	14	4.04	970/1339	4.17	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	1007/1498	3.99	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	8	10	3.85	1030/1428	3.90	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	1	2	7	8	3.64	1139/1407	3.59	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	1	7	11	3.59	1290/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	7	8	6	3.82	1121/1518	3.64	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1199/1472	4.07	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	1390/1475	4.24	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	1163/1471	3.89	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	1268/1470	3.82	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	5	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1218/1310	3.23	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.09
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	8	11	3.96	806/1210	3.65	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	5	5	12	3.96	947/1211	4.23	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	6	5	10	3.76	1034/1207	3.77	3.83	4.41	4.51	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	3	1	3	7	7	3.67	646/859	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gray,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	6	7	10	3.85	152/207	3.99	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	101/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	2	0	0	6	18	4.46	116/202	4.63	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	2	3	8	11	3.92	163/202	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	5	5	1	9	6	3.23	190/199	3.48	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.23
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	4.17	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	2.17	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gray,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	1.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 4</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	5	9	3.90	1265/1542	3.93	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	4	9	4.10	1078/1542	3.94	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	785/1339	4.17	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1176/1498	3.99	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	6	8	3.95	931/1428	3.90	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1192/1407	3.59	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	560/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	1093/1518	3.64	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	753/1472	4.07	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	1158/1475	4.24	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1104/1471	3.89	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	1002/1470	3.82	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	943/1310	3.23	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.77
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	6	4	3.33	1073/1210	3.65	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	580/1211	4.23	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	5	0	10	3.78	1031/1207	3.77	3.83	4.41	4.51	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	463/859	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.06

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 4</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	116/207	3.99	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	123/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	44/202	4.63	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	109/202	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	154/199	3.48	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.73

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 300 4	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Title:</b>	Analytical Chemistry		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	Hamilton,Diana			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	5	9	3.90	1265/1542	3.93	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	4	9	4.10	1078/1542	3.94	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	785/1339	4.17	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1176/1498	3.99	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	6	8	3.95	931/1428	3.90	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1192/1407	3.59	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	560/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	3	1	6	3	0	2.69	1476/1518	3.64	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1419/1472	4.07	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1440/1475	4.24	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1400/1471	3.89	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1377/1470	3.82	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1310	3.23	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.77
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	6	4	3.33	1073/1210	3.65	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	580/1211	4.23	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	5	0	10	3.78	1031/1207	3.77	3.83	4.41	4.51	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	463/859	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.06

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 4</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hamilton,Diana</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	116/207	3.99	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	123/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	44/202	4.63	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	109/202	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	154/199	3.48	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.73

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 4</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	5	9	3.90	1265/1542	3.93	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	4	9	4.10	1078/1542	3.94	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	785/1339	4.17	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1176/1498	3.99	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	6	8	3.95	931/1428	3.90	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1192/1407	3.59	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	560/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	857/1518	3.64	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1148/1472	4.07	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1271/1475	4.24	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	637/1471	3.89	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	886/1470	3.82	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1310	3.23	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.77
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	6	4	3.33	1073/1210	3.65	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	580/1211	4.23	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	5	0	10	3.78	1031/1207	3.77	3.83	4.41	4.51	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	463/859	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.06

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 4</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bass,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	116/207	3.99	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	123/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	44/202	4.63	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	109/202	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	154/199	3.48	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.73

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 4</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gray,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	5	9	3.90	1265/1542	3.93	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	4	9	4.10	1078/1542	3.94	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	785/1339	4.17	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1176/1498	3.99	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	6	8	3.95	931/1428	3.90	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1192/1407	3.59	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	560/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	783/1518	3.64	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1022/1472	4.07	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1271/1475	4.24	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	637/1471	3.89	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	886/1470	3.82	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1310	3.23	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.77
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	6	4	3.33	1073/1210	3.65	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	580/1211	4.23	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	5	0	10	3.78	1031/1207	3.77	3.83	4.41	4.51	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	463/859	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.06



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 300 4</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Analytical Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gray,A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	116/207	3.99	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	123/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	44/202	4.63	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	109/202	4.16	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	154/199	3.48	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.73

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 302 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Physical Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Thorpe,Ian F</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	4	9	10	3.79	1326/1542	3.79	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	8	8	3.68	1338/1542	3.68	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	12	4.21	857/1339	4.21	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1267/1498	3.69	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	4	7	8	3.95	918/1428	3.95	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	3	1	4	4	3.54	1192/1407	3.54	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	9	15	4.36	721/1521	4.36	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	12	6	1	3.04	1419/1518	3.04	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.04
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	9	9	6	3.59	1386/1472	3.59	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	5	4	11	6	3.59	1442/1475	3.59	4.41	4.72	4.74	3.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	6	10	4	5	3.15	1398/1471	3.15	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	8	6	6	3.30	1371/1470	3.30	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	5	5	6	4	3.13	1203/1310	3.13	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.51	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 302 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Physical Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Thorpe,Ian F</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 303 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Phys Chem For Biochem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Geddes,Christop</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	8	16	4.26	962/1542	4.26	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	13	11	4.06	1095/1542	4.06	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	19	4.52	571/1339	4.52	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1498	****	3.80	4.26	4.32	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	7	6	8	2	1	2.33	1419/1428	2.33	3.83	4.12	4.15	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	****/1407	****	3.74	4.15	4.20	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	7	16	4.19	902/1521	4.19	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	14	9	4.07	1439/1541	4.07	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	7	14	5	3.85	1093/1518	3.85	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.85
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	13	13	4.31	1042/1472	4.31	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	951/1475	4.72	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	4	13	8	3.79	1228/1471	3.79	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	8	15	4.24	968/1470	4.24	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.24

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 303 1	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 98
<b>Title:</b> Phys Chem For Biochem		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 31
<b>Instructor:</b> Geddes,Christop		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	536/1310	4.29	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.29

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	30
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 312L 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arnold,Bradley</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	3.97	4.33	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1339	5.00	3.81	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1498	5.00	3.80	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	181/1428	4.88	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	3.74	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1521	4.63	3.85	4.20	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.67	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	181/1518	4.27	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1472	4.29	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1471	4.29	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1470	4.17	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	201/1310	3.83	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.67
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.04	4.12	4.17	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/210	4.50	4.14	4.17	4.21	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.75	4.53	4.50	4.54	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 312L 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arnold,Bradley</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/199	4.63	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.75

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 312L 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mannin,Steven</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	3.97	4.33	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1339	5.00	3.81	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1498	5.00	3.80	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	181/1428	4.88	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	3.74	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1521	4.63	3.85	4.20	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.67	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	588/1518	4.27	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	598/1472	4.29	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1471	4.29	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	498/1470	4.17	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	201/1310	3.83	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.67
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.04	4.12	4.17	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/210	4.50	4.14	4.17	4.21	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.75	4.53	4.50	4.54	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 312L 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mannin,Steven</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/199	4.63	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.75

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 312L 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arnold,Bradley</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	3.97	4.33	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1339	5.00	3.81	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1498	5.00	3.80	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1428	4.88	3.83	4.12	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	3.74	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	838/1521	4.63	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1268/1541	4.67	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	4.27	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1472	4.29	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1471	4.29	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1470	4.17	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1310	3.83	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1210	5.00	3.53	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1211	5.00	3.94	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1207	5.00	3.83	4.41	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/859	5.00	3.76	4.08	4.13	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 312L 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arnold,Bradley</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.04	4.12	4.17	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	138/210	4.50	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	104/202	4.75	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/199	4.63	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.50

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 312L 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ghann, William</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	3.97	4.33	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1339	5.00	3.81	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1498	5.00	3.80	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1428	4.88	3.83	4.12	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	3.74	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	838/1521	4.63	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1268/1541	4.67	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1425/1518	4.27	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1464/1472	4.29	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1469/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1454/1471	4.29	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1463/1470	4.17	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1308/1310	3.83	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1210	5.00	3.53	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1211	5.00	3.94	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1207	5.00	3.83	4.41	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/859	5.00	3.76	4.08	4.13	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 312L 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Advanced Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ghann, William</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.04	4.12	4.17	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	138/210	4.50	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	104/202	4.75	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/199	4.63	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.50

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351 1		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 170					
Title: Organic Chemistry I										Questionnaires: 76					
Instructor: Perks,Harry M															
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>General</b>															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course		1	0	1	2	11	21	40	4.29	918/1542	4.29	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	12	20	44	4.42	726/1542	4.42	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	1	2	13	23	37	4.22	849/1339	4.22	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		0	28	0	2	7	16	23	4.25	854/1498	4.25	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		0	2	1	4	16	14	39	4.16	725/1428	4.16	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		1	40	0	2	5	9	19	4.29	651/1407	4.29	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		1	0	1	2	13	20	39	4.25	838/1521	4.25	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	0	75	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		12	1	2	1	11	28	21	4.03	896/1518	4.03	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.03
<b>Lecture</b>															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		1	0	0	0	4	10	61	4.76	435/1472	4.76	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		1	0	0	0	1	4	70	4.92	430/1475	4.92	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		1	0	0	2	8	19	46	4.45	711/1471	4.45	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		2	0	2	3	10	12	47	4.34	886/1470	4.34	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		3	6	2	2	8	16	39	4.31	515/1310	4.31	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.31
<b>Discussion</b>															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		64	0	1	1	1	7	2	3.67	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		64	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		64	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful		64	5	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>76</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.24	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	2.17	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	29						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	17	General	1	Under-grad	75	Non-major	73
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	17						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	869/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1308/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	8	2	3.91	1054/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1225/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1097/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1192/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1046/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	8	3	3.92	1029/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.85
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	303/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	430/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	755/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	660/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	262/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1007/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	507/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	722/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	478/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	92/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	131/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.09
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	104/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	72/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	156/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.73
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	4.17	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	2.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	1.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	1.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	869/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1308/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	8	2	3.91	1054/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1225/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1097/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1192/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1046/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1147/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.85
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1022/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1158/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	870/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	1065/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	576/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1007/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	507/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	722/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	478/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	92/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	131/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.09
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	104/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	72/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	156/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.73
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	4.17	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	2.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	1.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	1.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1124/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	776/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	809/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	500/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	797/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	599/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	944/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	849/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.16
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	766/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1134/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	870/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	960/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	384/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.44
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	774/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	918/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	630/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	146/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	118/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	123/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	56/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	74/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>SchouKroun,L.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1124/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	776/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	809/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	500/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	797/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	599/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	944/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	721/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.16
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1162/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1197/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1031/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	934/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.44
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	774/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	918/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	630/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>SchouKroun,L.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	146/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	118/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	123/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	56/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	74/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P	0						
			I	0	Other	1				
			?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	844/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	892/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1054/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1017/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	578/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	706/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1011/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	629/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.15
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	817/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1039/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	870/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	800/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	293/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.55
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	81/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	83/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	173/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	129/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	117/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.08

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arthur,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	844/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	892/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1054/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1017/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	578/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	706/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1011/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	920/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.15
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1385/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1397/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1224/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1108/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.55
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arthur,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	81/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	83/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	173/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	129/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	117/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.08

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1095/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1343/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1071/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	996/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	851/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1126/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	986/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1078/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.10
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	899/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1039/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1187/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1230/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	893/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	90/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	202/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	69/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	105/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	109/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.14
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 1	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Grow,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1095/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1343/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1071/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	996/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	851/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1126/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	986/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	588/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.10
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	690/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1119/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	946/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1108/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1064/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Grow,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	90/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	202/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	69/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	105/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	109/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.14
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1387/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1222/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	1127/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	996/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	780/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	1144/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	330/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	822/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1106/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	861/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1283/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1189/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	893/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.18
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	201/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	2.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	126/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	180/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.33

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1387/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1222/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	1127/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	996/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	780/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	1144/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	330/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	469/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1039/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	785/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	374/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	324/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.18
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Toonstra,C.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	201/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	2.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	126/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	180/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.33

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1173/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	528/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	896/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	986/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	598/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1013/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	806/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	588/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	217/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	324/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	121/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	25/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.75

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>SchouKroun,L.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1173/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	528/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	896/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	986/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	598/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1013/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	806/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	588/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1271/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>SchouKroun,L.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	121/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	25/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.75

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	632/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	615/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	373/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	604/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	127/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	784/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	518/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	874/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	286/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	700/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	425/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	453/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	285/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	924/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	580/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	918/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	33/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	40/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	37/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	72/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	28/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.73

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arthur,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	632/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	615/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	373/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	604/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	127/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	784/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	518/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	874/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	219/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	418/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	861/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	319/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	924/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	580/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	918/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arthur,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	33/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	40/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	37/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	72/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	28/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.73

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	818/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1122/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1093/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1058/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	769/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	874/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1369/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1184/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	983/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1092/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	946/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1108/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	948/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	924/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1178/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	630/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	646/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Perks,Harry M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	44/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	49/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	147/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	129/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	89/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Grow,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	818/1542	4.18	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1122/1542	4.13	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1093/1339	4.05	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1058/1498	4.15	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	769/1428	4.19	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	874/1407	3.93	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1369/1521	4.15	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1326/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	367/1472	4.55	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1351/1475	4.61	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	785/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1470	4.37	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1218/1310	4.16	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	924/1210	3.75	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1178/1211	4.03	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	630/1207	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	646/859	3.83	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.67



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 351L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Grow,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	44/207	4.11	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	49/210	4.25	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	147/202	4.60	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	129/202	4.58	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	89/199	4.19	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch,Tiffan</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>238</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>106</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	22	76	4.61	499/1542	4.59	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	25	72	4.58	516/1542	4.54	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	10	23	67	4.45	649/1339	4.30	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	0	12	18	62	4.51	549/1498	4.31	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	12	27	65	4.45	442/1428	4.40	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	1	3	13	12	47	4.33	609/1407	4.17	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	18	79	4.64	356/1521	4.61	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	22	82	4.75	906/1541	4.68	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	5	0	0	3	28	56	4.61	295/1518	4.45	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.61
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	12	92	4.88	240/1472	4.84	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	97	4.93	376/1475	4.91	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	22	79	4.75	359/1471	4.63	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	8	16	79	4.66	498/1470	4.63	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	2	6	14	73	4.66	201/1310	4.55	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.66
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	98	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	97	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	98	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch,Tiffan</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>238</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>106</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.44	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.18	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	37	Required for Majors	80	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	34						
56-83	23	2.00-2.99	9	C	18	General	1	Under-grad	106	Non-major	105
84-150	28	3.00-3.49	17	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	39	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	12						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch,Tiffan</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>70</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	3	5	11	49	4.56	572/1542	4.59	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	5	14	46	4.50	615/1542	4.54	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	13	19	32	4.15	911/1339	4.30	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	1	5	8	18	28	4.12	996/1498	4.31	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	0	8	18	37	4.35	536/1428	4.40	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	3	8	20	18	4.02	864/1407	4.17	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.02
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	18	45	4.57	441/1521	4.61	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	4	18	45	4.61	1038/1541	4.68	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	0	8	20	28	4.30	640/1518	4.45	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.30
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	7	57	4.80	367/1472	4.84	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	6	59	4.88	619/1475	4.91	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	3	19	41	4.51	637/1471	4.63	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	13	47	4.60	588/1470	4.63	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	2	3	20	32	4.44	394/1310	4.55	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.44
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	61	0	2	0	0	5	2	3.56	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	60	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	62	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	61	2	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gierasch,Tiffan</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>70</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	68	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.04	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.14	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.53	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.33	4.32	4.44	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	68	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	4.06	4.15	4.18	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	61	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	70	Non-major	63
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	11						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1131/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1060/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	956/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	728/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	892/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	373/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	568/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	781/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	740/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	1016/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	1	0	5	3	3.55	1046/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	774/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1025/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	556/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	113/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	61/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	55/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	40/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.85
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	67/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.46
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1131/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1060/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	956/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	728/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	892/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1269/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1202/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1039/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	2	4	4	3.40	1359/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1289/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	1	1	5	3	3.31	1153/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	774/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1025/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	556/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	113/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	61/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	55/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	40/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.85
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	67/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.46
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 352L 02	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab II		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 16
<b>Instructor:</b> Ptaszek, Marcin		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,D.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1131/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1060/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	956/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	728/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	892/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	219/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	303/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	700/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	525/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	660/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	761/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	774/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1025/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	556/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,D.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	113/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	61/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	55/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	40/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.85
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	67/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.46
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	3.84	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,D.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.17	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1104/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1122/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1228/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	599/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	785/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	588/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.94
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1072/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	987/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1187/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1247/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1103/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	60/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	112/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	160/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	56/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	122/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 03		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 13				
Instructor: Ptaszek, Marcin														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1104/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1122/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1228/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	599/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	785/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1248/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.94
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1183/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1197/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1348/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1268/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1141/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	60/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	112/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	160/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	56/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	122/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Odebode,T.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1104/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1122/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1228/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	599/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	785/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	7	1	3.89	1071/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.94
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1222/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1372/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1210/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1250/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Odebode,T.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	60/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	112/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	160/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	56/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	122/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	3	7	3.93	1237/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1095/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	1	8	3.93	958/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	1029/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	574/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	1	9	1	3.69	1196/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.79
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	598/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	969/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	938/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	1197/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1093/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.69
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	96/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	94/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	97/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	81/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.58

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	106/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.17

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	3	7	3.93	1237/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1095/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	1	8	3.93	958/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	1029/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	574/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	9	0	3.69	1196/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.79
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1003/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	700/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1201/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1201/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	923/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.69
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	96/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	94/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	97/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	81/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.58

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	106/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.17

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Thakur,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	3	7	3.93	1237/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1095/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	1	8	3.93	958/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	1029/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	574/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	920/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.79
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1148/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1134/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	770/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	800/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	905/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.69
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	96/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	94/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	97/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	81/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.58

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Thakur,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	106/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.17

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1300/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1394/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1268/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1390/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	1	3	3.42	1259/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	2	1	3.30	1288/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1313/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1283/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1222/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1358/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.02
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1322/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1374/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	2.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1206/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.37
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	144/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	201/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	167/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	181/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.56

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 352L 05	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab II		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 12
<b>Instructor:</b> Smith,Paul J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	136/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.90

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 05		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 12				
Instructor: Ptaszek, Marcin														
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1300/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1394/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1268/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1390/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	1	3	3.42	1259/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	2	1	3.30	1288/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1313/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1389/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1439/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1351/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.02
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	2	2	1	1	2.30	1462/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1422/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	2.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1033/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.37
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	144/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	201/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	167/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	181/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.56

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 352L 05	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab II		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 12
<b>Instructor:</b> Ptaszek, Marcin		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	136/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.90

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 05		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 12				
Instructor: Temburnikar,K.														
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1300/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1394/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1268/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1390/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	1	3	3.42	1259/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	2	1	3.30	1288/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1313/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1248/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1399/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1439/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.02
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1365/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	6	2	1	0	2.44	1447/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	2.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1113/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.37
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	144/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	201/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	167/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	181/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.56

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Temburnikar,K.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	136/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.90

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1173/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1278/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1082/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1308/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	874/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1046/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	3	0	3.38	1344/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	817/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	987/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1187/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1289/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	761/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	115/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	195/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	82/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	106/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.17

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 06		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 11				
Instructor: Ptaszek, Marcin														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1173/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1278/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1082/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1308/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	874/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1046/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	2	0	3.00	1425/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	1336/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1305/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	1452/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1382/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	761/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	115/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	195/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	82/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	106/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.17

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	CHEM 352L 06	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	18
<b>Title:</b>	Organic Chemistry Lab II		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	11
<b>Instructor:</b>	Talley,D.			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1173/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1278/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1082/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1308/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	874/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1046/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	181/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	256/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1092/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	346/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	692/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	115/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Talley,D.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	195/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	82/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	106/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.17

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1017/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	867/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	943/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1156/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	874/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	870/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	494/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	1106/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	1158/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1046/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	640/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.38
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	76/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	105/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	69/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 352L 07	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab II		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 10
<b>Instructor:</b> Smith,Paul J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	29/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.71

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1017/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	867/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	943/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1156/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	874/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	870/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1425/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	1106/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1241/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1385/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1065/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	948/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.38
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	76/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	105/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	69/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	29/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.71

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 07		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 10				
Instructor: Temburnikar,K.														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1017/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	867/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	943/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1058/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1156/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	874/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	870/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	494/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	728/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	969/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1015/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	498/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.38
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	76/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	105/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	69/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 352L 07	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab II		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 10
<b>Instructor:</b> Temburnikar,K.		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	29/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.71

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1124/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	5	2	3.64	1354/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1022/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	971/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1210/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	955/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1100/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	926/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	969/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	922/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1108/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1093/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	34/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	138/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	91/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	148/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	97/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.25

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 08		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 15				
Instructor: Ptaszek, Marcin														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1124/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	5	2	3.64	1354/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1022/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	971/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1210/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	955/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	1362/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1155/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1173/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1404/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	6	1	3.21	1383/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1093/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	34/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	138/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	91/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	148/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	97/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.25

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Khan,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1124/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	5	2	3.64	1354/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1022/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	971/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1210/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	955/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	1	5	3	1	2.85	1458/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1317/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1397/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1435/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1446/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1283/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Khan,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	34/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	138/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	91/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	148/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	97/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.25

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	6	0	3.18	1485/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1443/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1176/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1473/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1394/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	5	0	3.00	1349/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1271/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	1020/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	0	4	2	3.50	1283/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1385/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1391/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1343/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1218/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.15
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	203/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	2.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	157/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	167/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	198/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	2.60

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	193/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.20

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	6	0	3.18	1485/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1443/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1176/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1473/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1394/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	5	0	3.00	1349/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1271/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	1020/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	920/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1120/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1039/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1308/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1220/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1206/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.15
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	203/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	2.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	157/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	167/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	198/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	2.60

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	193/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.20

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shukla,B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	6	0	3.18	1485/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1443/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1176/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1473/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1394/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	5	0	3.00	1349/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1271/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	1020/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	0	0	2.86	1456/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1399/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1473/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1332/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1434/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1141/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	3.15
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	203/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	2.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	157/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	167/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	198/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	2.60

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shukla,B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>12</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	193/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.20

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 10		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 15				
Instructor: Smith,Paul J														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1131/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1122/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	880/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1017/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	736/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	997/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1242/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	920/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1003/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	843/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	846/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	692/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	761/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	121/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	107/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	120/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	99/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	103/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.18

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 10		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 15				
Instructor: Ptaszek, Marcin														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1131/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1122/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	880/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1017/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	736/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	997/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1242/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1310/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	1113/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	969/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1315/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1167/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	674/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	121/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	107/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	120/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	99/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	103/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.18

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Graduate	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Thakur,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1131/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1122/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	880/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1017/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	736/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	997/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1242/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	920/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1305/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	725/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	764/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	576/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	121/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Thakur,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	107/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	120/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	99/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	103/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.18

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 11		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 10				
Instructor: Smith,Paul J														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1265/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1376/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	1	1	2	2.89	1308/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1327/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6	0	2	3.22	1321/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1126/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	785/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1129/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.74
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	817/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	808/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1062/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1065/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1141/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	2.83
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	121/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	67/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	123/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	169/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	114/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.11

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 11		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18				
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II										Questionnaires: 10				
Instructor: Ptaszek, Marcin														
Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1265/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1376/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	1	1	2	2.89	1308/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1327/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6	0	2	3.22	1321/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1126/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	785/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1389/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.74
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1052/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1197/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1379/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	1	1	3	3.33	1361/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1295/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	2.83
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	121/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	67/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	123/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	169/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> CHEM 352L 11	<b>Term - Spring 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 18
<b>Title:</b> Organic Chemistry Lab II		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 10
<b>Instructor:</b> Ptaszek, Marcin		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	114/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.11

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Odebode,T.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1265/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1376/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	1	1	2	2.89	1308/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1327/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6	0	2	3.22	1321/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1126/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	785/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	721/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.74
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	1222/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	1417/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1245/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1030/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	2.83
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	121/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	67/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	123/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	169/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	3.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Odebode,T.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	114/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.11

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	940/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	904/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1212/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	1	4	3.36	1279/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1097/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1001/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1160/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	993/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	781/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1000/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1075/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	690/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.35
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	191/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	184/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	192/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	3.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	188/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.25

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	940/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	904/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1212/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	1	4	3.36	1279/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1097/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1001/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1283/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1193/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	1290/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1267/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1303/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	690/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.35
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	191/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	184/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	192/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	3.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	188/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.25

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Khan,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	940/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	904/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1212/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	1	4	3.36	1279/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1097/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1001/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	686/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	418/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	592/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	498/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.35
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 12</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Khan,M.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	191/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	184/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	192/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	3.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	188/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	3.25

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	869/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1069/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1082/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1258/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1007/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	740/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1257/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1160/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1106/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1158/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	870/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1108/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	761/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	112/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	94/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	81/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	129/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	39/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	869/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1069/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1082/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1258/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1007/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	740/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1257/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1283/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1336/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1241/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1283/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1193/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	761/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	112/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	94/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	81/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	129/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	39/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shukla,B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	869/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1069/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1082/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1258/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1007/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	740/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1257/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1236/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1305/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1379/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1046/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	934/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shukla,B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	112/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	94/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	81/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	129/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	39/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1315/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	582/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	688/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1191/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1256/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1286/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1213/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	954/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1351/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	985/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	960/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	761/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	80/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	79/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	136/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	122/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1315/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	582/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	688/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1191/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1256/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1286/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1213/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1222/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1351/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	785/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	960/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	761/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	80/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	79/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	136/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	122/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cunning,W.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1315/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	582/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	688/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1191/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1256/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1286/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	920/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	808/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	637/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	374/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 15</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cunning,W.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	80/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	79/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	136/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	122/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	869/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	698/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	885/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	810/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	463/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1479/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.56
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	899/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	592/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1283/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1333/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	905/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.15
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	739/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	769/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Smith,Paul J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	60/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	85/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	160/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	76/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	47/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.63
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	869/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	698/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	885/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	810/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	463/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1093/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.56
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1022/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1236/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	5	1	3.33	1361/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	893/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.15
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	739/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	769/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ptaszek, Marcin</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	60/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	85/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	160/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	76/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	47/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.63
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cunning,W.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	869/1542	4.01	3.97	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	698/1542	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.31	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	982/1339	3.80	3.81	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	885/1498	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.32	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	851/1428	3.71	3.83	4.12	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	810/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	463/1521	4.03	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	802/1518	3.73	3.75	4.11	4.13	3.56
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	418/1472	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	592/1475	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	463/1471	3.86	3.98	4.32	4.33	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	764/1470	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.35	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	140/1310	3.76	3.81	4.06	4.11	4.15
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1073/1210	3.67	3.53	4.18	4.27	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	739/1211	4.07	3.94	4.37	4.45	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	769/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 352L 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Organic Chemistry Lab II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cunning,W.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	60/207	4.03	4.04	4.12	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	85/210	4.08	4.14	4.17	4.21	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	160/202	4.44	4.53	4.50	4.54	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	76/202	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.44	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	47/199	4.12	4.06	4.15	4.18	4.63
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.46	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 401 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Chem/Stat Thermodynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Lisa A</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	632/1542	4.50	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	929/1542	4.25	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	721/1339	4.38	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	966/1498	4.14	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1097/1428	3.75	3.83	4.12	4.22	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1029/1407	3.83	3.74	4.15	4.30	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	124/1521	4.88	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	920/1518	4.00	3.75	4.11	4.18	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	983/1472	4.38	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	946/1471	4.25	3.98	4.32	4.36	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	692/1470	4.50	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1033/1310	3.57	3.81	4.06	4.09	3.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	774/1210	4.00	3.53	4.18	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1100/1211	3.50	3.94	4.37	4.47	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	918/1207	4.00	3.83	4.41	4.53	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 401 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Chem/Stat Thermodynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Lisa A</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	843/859	2.50	3.76	4.08	4.19	2.50

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 405 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Inorganic Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Onuta,Marie-Chr</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	3	7	19	4.25	962/1542	4.25	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	712/1542	4.44	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	694/1339	4.40	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	618/1498	4.45	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	4	4	7	9	3.46	1243/1428	3.46	3.83	4.12	4.22	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	4	7	17	4.46	455/1407	4.46	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	13	15	4.31	772/1521	4.31	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	482/1541	4.94	4.82	4.70	4.72	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	3	13	11	4.14	812/1518	4.14	3.75	4.11	4.18	4.14
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	6	22	4.52	804/1472	4.52	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	727/1475	4.84	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	1	9	18	4.35	846/1471	4.35	3.98	4.32	4.36	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	0	6	22	4.52	681/1470	4.52	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	2	4	6	7	3.67	991/1310	3.67	3.81	4.06	4.09	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.53	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 405 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Inorganic Chemistry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Onuta,Marie-Chr</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	28	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.19	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	4	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 7	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 1						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	135/1542	4.81	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1542	4.77	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	383/1339	4.66	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	240/1498	4.60	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	327/1428	4.44	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	225/1407	4.47	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	291/1521	4.47	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	895/1541	4.76	4.82	4.70	4.72	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1518	4.52	3.75	4.11	4.18	4.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1472	4.97	4.23	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1471	5.00	3.98	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1470	4.94	3.89	4.33	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	127/1310	4.74	3.81	4.06	4.09	4.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.53	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	13/207	4.74	4.04	4.12	4.41	4.92

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/210	4.89	4.14	4.17	4.02	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	74/202	4.74	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	26/202	4.96	4.33	4.32	4.23	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	122/199	3.67	4.06	4.15	3.77	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ku,Therese</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	135/1542	4.81	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1542	4.77	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	383/1339	4.66	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	240/1498	4.60	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	327/1428	4.44	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	225/1407	4.47	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	291/1521	4.47	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	895/1541	4.76	4.82	4.70	4.72	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	783/1518	4.52	3.75	4.11	4.18	4.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1472	4.97	4.23	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1475	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1471	5.00	3.98	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1470	4.94	3.89	4.33	4.38	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.53	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	13/207	4.74	4.04	4.12	4.41	4.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/210	4.89	4.14	4.17	4.02	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Ku,Therese</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	74/202	4.74	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	26/202	4.96	4.33	4.32	4.23	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	122/199	3.67	4.06	4.15	3.77	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate 0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 14	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	0			
			? 3					

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	410/1542	4.81	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	391/1542	4.77	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	455/1339	4.66	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	646/1498	4.60	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	578/1428	4.44	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	684/1407	4.47	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	838/1521	4.47	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	906/1541	4.76	4.82	4.70	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	219/1518	4.52	3.75	4.11	4.18	4.46
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	146/1472	4.97	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1471	5.00	3.98	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	217/1470	4.94	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	178/1310	4.74	3.81	4.06	4.09	4.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.19	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tracy,Allison M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	49/207	4.74	4.04	4.12	4.41	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	23/210	4.89	4.14	4.17	4.02	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	52/202	4.74	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/202	4.96	4.33	4.32	4.23	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	4	1	1	3	3.33	180/199	3.67	4.06	4.15	3.77	3.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 3		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 21				
Title: Biochemistry Laboratory										Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor: Neal, Jacob														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	410/1542	4.81	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	391/1542	4.77	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	455/1339	4.66	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	646/1498	4.60	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	578/1428	4.44	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	684/1407	4.47	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	838/1521	4.47	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	906/1541	4.76	4.82	4.70	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	721/1518	4.52	3.75	4.11	4.18	4.46
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1472	4.97	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1475	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1471	5.00	3.98	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1470	4.94	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.88
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1211	****	3.94	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1207	****	3.83	4.41	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.19	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	49/207	4.74	4.04	4.12	4.41	4.56

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 437L 3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Biochemistry Laboratory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Neal, Jacob</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	23/210	4.89	4.14	4.17	4.02	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	52/202	4.74	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/202	4.96	4.33	4.32	4.23	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	4	1	1	3	3.33	180/199	3.67	4.06	4.15	3.77	3.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 438 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Biochem II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Fishbein,James</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1275/1542	3.89	3.97	4.33	4.42	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1291/1542	3.78	4.00	4.29	4.33	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	935/1339	4.11	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1498	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1082/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	4.22	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1256/1407	3.40	3.74	4.15	4.30	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1308/1521	3.56	3.85	4.20	4.24	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1354/1518	3.00	3.75	4.11	4.18	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	753/1472	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1305/1475	4.39	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1187/1471	3.67	3.98	4.32	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1065/1470	3.72	3.89	4.33	4.38	3.72

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 438 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Biochem II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Fishbein,James</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1310	3.89	3.81	4.06	4.09	3.89

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 9 Non-major 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 438 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Biochem II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Karpel,R L</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1275/1542	3.89	3.97	4.33	4.42	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1291/1542	3.78	4.00	4.29	4.33	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	935/1339	4.11	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1498	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1082/1428	3.78	3.83	4.12	4.22	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1256/1407	3.40	3.74	4.15	4.30	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1308/1521	3.56	3.85	4.20	4.24	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	3	3	2	0	2.67	1479/1518	3.00	3.75	4.11	4.18	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1222/1472	4.28	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1241/1475	4.39	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1348/1471	3.67	3.98	4.32	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1361/1470	3.72	3.89	4.33	4.38	3.72

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 438 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comprehensive Biochem II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Karpel,R L</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	875/1310	3.89	3.81	4.06	4.09	3.89

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 455 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Biomedical Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seley-Radtke,Ka</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>59</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	12	40	4.57	560/1542	4.57	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	13	38	4.52	602/1542	4.52	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	7	44	4.57	518/1339	4.57	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	1	3	3	8	35	4.46	604/1498	4.46	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	2	6	8	9	26	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	3	2	9	18	4.12	819/1407	4.12	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	3	4	11	37	4.43	630/1521	4.43	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	35	18	4.31	1286/1541	4.31	4.82	4.70	4.72	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	1	2	14	26	4.43	457/1518	4.43	3.75	4.11	4.18	4.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	6	45	4.85	303/1472	4.85	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	0	50	4.92	430/1475	4.92	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	1	15	34	4.54	607/1471	4.54	3.98	4.32	4.36	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	0	12	38	4.63	543/1470	4.63	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	0	1	6	11	25	4.40	435/1310	4.40	3.81	4.06	4.09	4.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	3	1	8	3.93	****/1210	****	3.53	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	580/1211	4.50	3.94	4.37	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	666/1207	4.47	3.83	4.41	4.53	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	44	9	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.19	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 455 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Biomedical Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seley-Radtke,Ka</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>59</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.39	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	5.00	4.62	4.70	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	5.00	4.57	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	5.00	4.29	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	5.00	4.25	2.67	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 455 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Biomedical Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seley-Radtke,Ka</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>59</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	5.00	4.14	3.33	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 2	A 34	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 2 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 57 Non-major 50
84-150	20	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 23	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 8		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 461 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Instrumental Methods</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cullum,Brian M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	499/1542	4.61	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	553/1542	4.56	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	414/1339	4.67	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	604/1498	4.47	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	629/1428	4.25	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1407	4.86	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	167/1521	4.82	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	763/1518	3.91	3.75	4.11	4.18	3.91
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1472	4.54	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	879/1475	4.47	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	256/1471	4.33	3.98	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	361/1470	4.40	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	270/1310	4.57	3.81	4.06	4.09	4.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	523/1210	4.40	3.53	4.18	4.34	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1211	5.00	3.94	4.37	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	344/1207	4.80	3.83	4.41	4.53	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.19	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 461 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Instrumental Methods</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cullum,Brian M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	51/207	4.55	4.04	4.12	4.41	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	167/210	3.73	4.14	4.17	4.02	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	120/202	4.45	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	176/202	3.82	4.33	4.32	4.23	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	3	0	1	5	3.36	177/199	3.36	4.06	4.15	3.77	3.36

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	2	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 461 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Instrumental Methods</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang,Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	499/1542	4.61	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	553/1542	4.56	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	414/1339	4.67	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	604/1498	4.47	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	629/1428	4.25	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1407	4.86	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	167/1521	4.82	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	1	5	4	3.69	1196/1518	3.91	3.75	4.11	4.18	3.91
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	899/1472	4.54	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1197/1475	4.47	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	1104/1471	4.33	3.98	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	0	0	6	4.25	960/1470	4.40	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1310	4.57	3.81	4.06	4.09	4.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	523/1210	4.40	3.53	4.18	4.34	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1211	5.00	3.94	4.37	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	344/1207	4.80	3.83	4.41	4.53	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.19	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 461 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Instrumental Methods</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mang, Stephen A.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	51/207	4.55	4.04	4.12	4.41	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	167/210	3.73	4.14	4.17	4.02	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	120/202	4.45	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	176/202	3.82	4.33	4.32	4.23	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	3	0	1	5	3.36	177/199	3.36	4.06	4.15	3.77	3.36

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	2	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 461 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Instrumental Methods</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dahal,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	499/1542	4.61	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	553/1542	4.56	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	414/1339	4.67	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	604/1498	4.47	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	629/1428	4.25	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1407	4.86	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	167/1521	4.82	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	709/1518	3.91	3.75	4.11	4.18	3.91
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	520/1472	4.54	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1092/1475	4.47	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	463/1471	4.33	3.98	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	588/1470	4.40	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1310	4.57	3.81	4.06	4.09	4.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	523/1210	4.40	3.53	4.18	4.34	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1211	5.00	3.94	4.37	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	344/1207	4.80	3.83	4.41	4.53	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.19	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 461 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Instrumental Methods</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dahal,S.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	51/207	4.55	4.04	4.12	4.41	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	167/210	3.73	4.14	4.17	4.02	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	120/202	4.45	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	176/202	3.82	4.33	4.32	4.23	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	3	0	1	5	3.36	177/199	3.36	4.06	4.15	3.77	3.36

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	2	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 461 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Instrumental Methods</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Federowski,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	499/1542	4.61	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	553/1542	4.56	4.00	4.29	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	414/1339	4.67	3.81	4.32	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	604/1498	4.47	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	629/1428	4.25	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1407	4.86	3.74	4.15	4.30	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	167/1521	4.82	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1272/1518	3.91	3.75	4.11	4.18	3.91
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1222/1472	4.54	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1397/1475	4.47	4.41	4.72	4.74	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1210/1471	4.33	3.98	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1108/1470	4.40	3.89	4.33	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1310	4.57	3.81	4.06	4.09	4.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	523/1210	4.40	3.53	4.18	4.34	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1211	5.00	3.94	4.37	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	344/1207	4.80	3.83	4.41	4.53	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	3.76	4.08	4.19	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 461 2</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Instrumental Methods</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Federowski,J.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	51/207	4.55	4.04	4.12	4.41	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	167/210	3.73	4.14	4.17	4.02	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	120/202	4.45	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	176/202	3.82	4.33	4.32	4.23	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	3	0	1	5	3.36	177/199	3.36	4.06	4.15	3.77	3.36

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	2	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>An,Songon</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	780/1542	4.40	3.97	4.33	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1278/1542	3.80	4.00	4.29	4.33	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	1185/1339	3.60	3.81	4.32	4.44	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1058/1498	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	780/1428	4.11	3.83	4.12	4.22	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	3	3.80	1053/1407	3.80	3.74	4.15	4.30	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	518/1521	4.50	3.85	4.20	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	959/1541	4.70	4.82	4.70	4.72	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1344/1518	3.38	3.75	4.11	4.18	3.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	690/1472	4.60	4.23	4.46	4.50	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1267/1471	3.70	3.98	4.32	4.36	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1254/1470	3.70	3.89	4.33	4.38	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	973/1310	3.70	3.81	4.06	4.09	3.70
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1207/1210	2.00	3.53	4.18	4.34	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1144/1211	3.25	3.94	4.37	4.47	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	815/1207	4.25	3.83	4.41	4.53	4.25



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>CHEM 490 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Chem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>An,Songon</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.56	4.62	****

### Frequency Distribution

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