

Course-Section: SCIE 501S 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: ROLAND, JONATHO  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1350  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.69	4.30	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	478/1285	4.56	4.72	4.30	4.31	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	367/1476	4.61	4.58	4.22	4.31	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	420/1412	4.41	4.57	4.06	4.25	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	392/1381	4.44	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	13	4.39	650/1500	4.39	4.45	4.18	4.22	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	164/1497	4.79	4.43	4.11	4.21	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	224/1440	4.89	4.68	4.45	4.48	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.95	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	263/1436	4.78	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.55	4.29	4.33	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	175/1221	4.67	3.94	3.93	3.83	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	147/1280	4.89	4.72	4.10	4.24	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	245/1277	4.89	4.80	4.34	4.52	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	149/ 854	4.65	4.55	4.02	4.08	4.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	37/ 215	4.86	4.68	4.36	4.72	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	53/ 228	4.71	4.28	4.35	4.39	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	46/ 217	4.86	4.65	4.51	4.61	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	32/ 216	4.93	4.41	4.42	4.76	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	20/ 205	4.91	4.29	4.23	4.40	4.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/ 79	4.83	4.69	4.58	4.76	4.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/ 77	4.80	4.71	4.52	4.70	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.38	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.63	4.45	4.66	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.38	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.67	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.57	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.80	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.50	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: SCIE 501S 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: ROLAND, JONATHO  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1350  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCIE 503 2301  
 Title LIFE SCI CONCEPTS/PRIN  
 Instructor: JENKINS, PENNY  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1351  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	991/1522	4.17	4.69	4.30	4.45	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1313/1522	3.64	4.64	4.26	4.29	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	809/1285	4.20	4.72	4.30	4.31	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1376/1476	3.27	4.58	4.22	4.31	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	384/1412	4.45	4.57	4.06	4.25	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	763/1381	4.08	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1351/1500	3.42	4.45	4.18	4.22	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1258/1497	3.56	4.43	4.11	4.21	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.68	4.45	4.48	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.95	4.71	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1158/1436	3.91	4.57	4.29	4.37	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1248/1432	3.58	4.55	4.29	4.33	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	448/1221	4.27	3.94	3.93	3.83	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	690/1280	4.08	4.72	4.10	4.24	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.80	4.34	4.52	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.82	4.31	4.51	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	413/ 854	4.10	4.55	4.02	4.08	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	109/ 215	4.42	4.68	4.36	4.72	4.42	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	4.28	4.35	4.39	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	96/ 217	4.64	4.65	4.51	4.61	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	163/ 216	4.18	4.41	4.42	4.76	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	173/ 205	3.75	4.29	4.23	4.40	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	55/ 79	4.56	4.69	4.58	4.76	4.56	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	52/ 77	4.63	4.71	4.52	4.70	4.63	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	48/ 65	4.38	4.38	4.49	4.71	4.38	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	60/ 78	4.22	4.63	4.45	4.66	4.22	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	2	4	1	2	3.10	69/ 80	3.10	4.26	4.11	4.38	3.10	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	40/ 47	3.60	3.60	4.41	4.40	3.60	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	30/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.49	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	19/ 39	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.78	4.67	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.71	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	15/ 34	4.67	4.67	4.30	4.82	4.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	30/ 37	4.14	4.57	4.63	4.82	4.14	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	15/ 23	4.00	4.00	4.41	4.68	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	25/ 33	4.60	4.80	4.69	4.79	4.60	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	18/ 22	4.00	4.50	4.54	4.83	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: SCIE 503 2301  
 Title LIFE SCI CONCEPTS/PRIN  
 Instructor: JENKINS, PENNY  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1351  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	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	6	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCIE 521 2301  
 Title CHEMISTRY CONCEPTS II  
 Instructor: ENSOR, SUE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1352  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	929/1522	4.22	4.69	4.30	4.45	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	639/1522	4.44	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1078/1285	3.78	4.72	4.30	4.31	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.58	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1213/1412	3.43	4.57	4.06	4.25	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1265/1381	3.17	4.28	4.08	4.25	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.45	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1251/1517	4.29	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1049/1497	3.89	4.43	4.11	4.21	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	984/1440	4.33	4.68	4.45	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.95	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	751/1436	4.38	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.55	4.29	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	564/1221	4.11	3.94	3.93	3.83	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	530/1280	4.33	4.72	4.10	4.24	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	891/1277	4.13	4.80	4.34	4.52	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.82	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	4.55	4.02	4.08	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	102/ 215	4.44	4.68	4.36	4.72	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	170/ 228	4.11	4.28	4.35	4.39	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	139/ 217	4.44	4.65	4.51	4.61	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	171/ 216	4.11	4.41	4.42	4.76	4.11	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	113/ 205	4.22	4.29	4.23	4.40	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	50/ 79	4.67	4.69	4.58	4.76	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.71	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.38	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 78	4.67	4.63	4.45	4.66	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	29/ 80	4.67	4.26	4.11	4.38	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.67	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.57	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.80	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.50	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: SCIE 521 2301  
 Title CHEMISTRY CONCEPTS II  
 Instructor: ENSOR, SUE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1352  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	6				
				?	0						