

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 254
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	6	4	7	5	3.20	1595/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	11	5	4	3.16	1590/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	9	4	4	1	2.32	1417/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	3	3	3	3	2	2.86	1583/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	1	4	5	6	3.18	1392/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	****/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	9	6	3.52	1434/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	2	3	7	1	3.20	1494/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	1074/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	1315/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	4	3	10	3.65	1352/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	3	6	7	3.50	1367/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	3	1	6	7	3.55	1017/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	2	9	4	3	2.76	1432/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	4	2	11	6	3.60	1274/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	2	4	8	8	3.64	1274/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	3	4	10	2	5	3.08	875/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Frequency Distribution				Reasons	Type	Majors			
		Expected Grades									
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 255
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	6	4	7	5	3.20	1595/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	11	5	4	3.16	1590/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	9	4	4	1	2.32	1417/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	3	3	3	3	2	2.86	1583/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	1	4	5	6	3.18	1392/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	****/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	4	9	3.52	1434/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	0	8	5	0	3.07	1531/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	1300/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	1434/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	2	5	2	4	3.00	1504/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	3	4	2	5	3.18	1462/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	4	2	1	2	1	2.40	1338/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	2	9	4	3	2.76	1432/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	4	2	11	6	3.60	1274/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	2	4	8	8	3.64	1274/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	3	4	10	2	5	3.08	875/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.08	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	2	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	2	Non-major
			Other	7	25
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 256
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	8	4	3.59	1483/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	12	0	3.36	1550/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	8	5	3	3	2.95	1374/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	1591/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	926/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1475/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	3	3	8	2	2.95	1576/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	3	7	3	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	12	5	3.82	1397/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	2	6	10	4.10	1456/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	7	9	0	3.05	1500/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	5	7	2	3.05	1480/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	4	1	3	5	2	3.00	1217/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	5	3	5	3.05	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	5	7	4	3.43	1333/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	7	3	6	3	3.05	1414/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	4	2	5	6	3.24	839/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	255/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	227/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	137/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	56/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	3.14	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	74/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	2.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	3	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	53/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	47/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	3.29	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	31/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	3.71	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	29/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	3.17	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 256
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 1	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 15		
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 257
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	8	4	3.59	1483/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	12	0	3.36	1550/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	8	5	3	3	2.95	1374/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	1591/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	926/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1475/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	3	3	8	2	2.95	1576/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1486/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	826/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	1309/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1420/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1240/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	770/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	5	3	5	3.05	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	5	7	4	3.43	1333/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	7	3	6	3	3.05	1414/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	4	2	5	6	3.24	839/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	1	1	0	4	0	3.17	255/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	227/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	137/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	56/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	3.14	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	74/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	2.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	3	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	53/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	47/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	3.29	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	31/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	3.71	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	29/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	3.17	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara(Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 257
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 258
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	10	10	0	3.17	1603/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	8	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	5	3	8	3.29	1324/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	4	3	3	7	0	2.76	1591/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	7	6	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1366/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	6	10	3.88	1246/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	12	5	1	3.10	1527/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	1280/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	1383/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	5	10	2	3.38	1446/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	5	6	5	3.27	1439/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	1108/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	9	3	4	3.04	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	6	7	7	3.78	1191/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	9	5	5	3.35	1348/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	3	7	6	3	3.04	878/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.04	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 2	A 4	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	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 13	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 259
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	10	10	0	3.17	1603/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	8	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	5	3	8	3.29	1324/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	4	3	3	7	0	2.76	1591/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	7	6	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1366/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	6	10	3.88	1246/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	0	8	8	2	3.40	1421/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	1044/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	1335/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	8	5	3.77	1290/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	4	7	7	3.85	1240/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	2	5	11	4.05	648/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	9	3	4	3.04	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	6	7	7	3.78	1191/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	9	5	5	3.35	1348/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	3	7	6	3	3.04	878/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.04	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 2	A 4	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	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 13	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 260
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	9	4	7	3.73	1420/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	8	3	3.59	1455/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	2	4	2.91	1386/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	3	0	4	3	0	2.70	1596/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	6	6	5	3.74	1066/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1342/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	11	6	3.95	1162/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	7	10	0	3.35	1438/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	1198/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	1150/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	6	6	7	3.68	1340/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	8	5	3.64	1339/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	3	4	2	5	3.31	1137/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	8	6	3.95	867/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	432/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	626/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	2	0	3	5	11	4.10	447/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 260
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 261
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	9	4	7	3.73	1420/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	8	3	3.59	1455/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	2	4	2.91	1386/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	3	0	4	3	0	2.70	1596/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	6	6	5	3.74	1066/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1342/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	11	6	3.95	1162/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	7	9	1	3.42	1412/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	974/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	1166/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	1272/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	6	9	3.81	1264/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	540/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	8	6	3.95	867/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	432/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	626/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	2	0	3	5	11	4.10	447/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 261
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0106
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 262
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	2	9	7	2	3.33	1563/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	7	6	2	3.10	1599/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	9	2	1	2.65	1406/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	4	7	2	3	3.00	1557/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	4	3	6	2	3.00	1440/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	3	4	4	1	3.08	1430/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	6	6	4	3.33	1504/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	7	4	0	3.15	1510/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	1255/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	5	4	10	4.00	1472/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	6	7	5	3.62	1367/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	7	6	4	3.29	1437/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	6	1	5	4	1	2.59	1313/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	6	6	2	3.05	1343/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	759/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	8	7	3	3.50	1308/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	1	6	8	2	3.25	835/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	3	1	2	4	0	0	2.43	264/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	2.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	4	0	3	3	0	2.50	276/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	2.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	4	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	241/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	3	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	251/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	95/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	3.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	2	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	91/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	3.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	2	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	77/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	0	1	1	0	1.83	75/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	1.83	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	77/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	2.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	58/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	2.83	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	51/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	2.83	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0106
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 262
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 263
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	5	5	9	4	3.42	1541/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	10	4	3.54	1479/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	12	2	3.28	1326/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	2	1	2	7	2	3.43	1477/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	838/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1240/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	10	8	3.96	1149/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	283/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	12	5	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	1335/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1489/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	5	11	3	3.71	1326/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	5	7	5	2	3.10	1474/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	3	4	7	1	1	2.56	1316/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	6	9	2	3.04	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	4	10	5	3.58	1279/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	7	9	4	3.42	1330/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	3	3	5	8	3	3.23	842/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 263
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 264
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	5	5	9	4	3.42	1541/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	10	4	3.54	1479/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	12	2	3.28	1326/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	2	1	2	7	2	3.43	1477/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	838/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1240/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	10	8	3.96	1149/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	283/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	6	7	6	3.71	1267/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	931/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	1225/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	7	10	4.00	1129/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	4	3	5	7	3.30	1432/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	4	5	10	3.91	796/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	6	9	2	3.04	1345/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	4	4	10	5	3.58	1279/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	1	7	9	4	3.42	1330/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	3	3	5	8	3	3.23	842/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 264
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0108
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 265
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	4	8	5	5	3.29	1574/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	6	6	3.42	1535/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	4	7	2	2.75	1401/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	3	4	6	2	3.31	1504/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	6	7	3	3.45	1260/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1435/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	7	7	5	3.52	1434/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	3	4	5	2	0	2.43	1625/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	8	3	7	3.45	1489/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	11	5	3.86	1515/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	5	5	4	2	2.75	1548/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	5	2	2	3	2.35	1556/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	6	2	3	0	2	2.23	1348/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	3	4	5	2	2.42	1479/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	2	6	8	6	3.58	1279/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	5	3	7	3	6	3.08	1408/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	7	3	4	3	7	3.00	881/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0108
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 266
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	4	8	5	5	3.29	1574/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	6	6	3.42	1535/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	4	7	2	2.75	1401/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	3	4	6	2	3.31	1504/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	6	7	3	3.45	1260/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1435/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	7	7	5	3.52	1434/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	2	4	5	1	3.07	1530/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	1	1	5	10	4.05	1275/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	1437/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	7	6	3	3.47	1416/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1329/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	2	0	5	1	8	3.81	859/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	3	4	5	2	2.42	1479/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	2	6	8	6	3.58	1279/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	5	3	7	3	6	3.08	1408/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	7	3	4	3	7	3.00	881/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0112
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 267
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	7	7	9	3	3.22	1590/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	9	7	9	2	3.15	1593/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	10	2	4	3	2.41	1413/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	4	7	6	4	1	2.59	1599/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	5	3	8	4	3.32	1339/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	4	5	2	1	2.60	1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	1	6	7	7	3.48	1450/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	1	24	4.81	887/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	8	6	1	3.53	1362/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	5	6	11	4.08	1260/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	11	10	4.20	1423/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	9	8	4	3.57	1385/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	2	6	7	4	3.32	1429/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	5	5	5	3	3.33	1127/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	12	6	2	2.96	1377/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	14	5	4	3.31	1370/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	7	8	6	3.54	1302/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	5	1	5	4	8	3.39	787/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.39	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0112
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 267
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	7	7	9	3	3.22	1590/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	9	7	9	2	3.15	1593/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	10	2	4	3	2.41	1413/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	4	7	6	4	1	2.59	1599/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	5	3	8	4	3.32	1339/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	4	5	2	1	2.60	1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	1	6	7	7	3.48	1450/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	1	24	4.81	887/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	3	2	3	2	0	2.40	1627/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	6	4	9	4.05	1275/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	1472/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	2	4	6	3	3.11	1495/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	1	3	6	3	2.95	1505/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	6	0	1	5	5	3.18	1187/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	12	6	2	2.96	1377/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	14	5	4	3.31	1370/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	7	8	6	3.54	1302/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	5	1	5	4	8	3.39	787/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.39	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0112
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 268
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 269
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	8	13	1	3.57	1492/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	9	6	3.70	1406/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	6	6	5	3.35	1313/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	3	8	5	0	3.13	1546/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	7	7	3	3.40	1297/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1425/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1070/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1184/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	763/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	1191/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	3	8	6	3.71	1326/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	4	12	4.10	1103/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	576/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	5	9	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	3	6	9	3.91	1137/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	7	8	6	3.86	1161/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	3	3	3	7	5	3.38	791/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 270
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	8	13	1	3.57	1492/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	9	6	3.70	1406/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	6	6	5	3.35	1313/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	3	8	5	0	3.13	1546/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	7	7	3	3.40	1297/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1425/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1070/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	3	8	3	2	3.12	1522/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1454/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	1472/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1314/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	1429/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1317/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	5	9	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	3	6	9	3.91	1137/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	7	8	6	3.86	1161/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	3	3	3	7	5	3.38	791/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 272
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	1046/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	3	3.88	1284/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	4	4	2	2.82	1396/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1517/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	879/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1246/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1139/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	301/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	853/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	829/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	915/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	284/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	4	4	3.29	1269/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	3	1	4	8	3.88	1145/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	1183/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	1	2	7	5	3.71	662/994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	14
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 273
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	9	10	2	3.46	1528/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	11	3	3.54	1479/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	6	2	3.04	1359/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	3	3	7	0	3.14	1541/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	4	3	4	4	3.24	1372/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	2	4	2	0	2.60	1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	8	9	3.96	1162/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	14	2	1	3.05	1533/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	9	4	6	3.55	1472/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	7	8	4	3.59	1546/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	13	6	0	3.09	1495/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	6	8	3	2	2.77	1530/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	5	5	0	3	2.80	1280/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	9	3	4	3.09	1337/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	7	4	11	4.09	999/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	5	10	7	4.00	1050/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	8	5	4	2	2.81	937/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	2.81	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 273
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 274
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	9	10	2	3.46	1528/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	11	3	3.54	1479/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	6	2	3.04	1359/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	3	3	7	0	3.14	1541/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	4	3	4	4	3.24	1372/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	2	4	2	0	2.60	1503/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	8	9	3.96	1162/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	10	3	3.80	1200/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	837/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	1250/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	7	6	7	3.70	1336/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	8	6	3.48	1377/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	5	6	6	3.65	968/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	9	3	4	3.09	1337/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	7	4	11	4.09	999/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	5	10	7	4.00	1050/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	8	5	4	2	2.81	937/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	2.81	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 274
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 275
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	3	6	8	3.95	1259/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	1035/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	5	6	3.70	1192/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	6	5	1	3.06	1553/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	926/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	4	5	2	3.43	1324/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1303/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	724/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	6	9	2	3.76	1230/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.98	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	1044/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	1208/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	1079/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1244/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	2	6	2	5	3.67	962/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	9	4	3.72	1051/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	827/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	927/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	432/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 275
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 276
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	3	6	8	3.95	1259/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	1035/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	5	6	3.70	1192/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	2	6	5	1	3.06	1553/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	926/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	4	5	2	3.43	1324/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1303/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	724/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	794/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.98	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	805/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	1225/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	850/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	867/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	880/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	9	4	3.72	1051/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	827/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	927/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	432/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 276
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0206
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 277
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	1	9	13	4	3.55	1495/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	10	6	7	3.45	1523/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	14	7	1	3.04	1360/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	1	7	2	1	2.92	1573/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	7	11	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1398/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	6	10	7	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	13	9	1	3.48	1390/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	10	13	4.27	1136/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	1083/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	8	12	5	3.88	1228/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	8	10	5	3.48	1374/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	6	3	6	3	3	2.71	1298/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	10	6	6	3.41	1221/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	3	12	9	4.00	1024/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	7	6	11	3.89	1150/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	4	7	7	7	3.58	708/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0206
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 278
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	1	9	13	4	3.55	1495/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	10	6	7	3.45	1523/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	14	7	1	3.04	1360/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	1	7	2	1	2.92	1573/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	7	11	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1398/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	6	10	7	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	9	11	1	3.62	1324/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	1024/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	1166/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	9	10	5	3.69	1336/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	2	3	9	7	3.63	1343/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	8	3	10	3.68	950/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	10	6	6	3.41	1221/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	3	12	9	4.00	1024/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	7	6	11	3.89	1150/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	4	7	7	7	3.58	708/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0207
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 279
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	0	7	6	12	4.08	1139/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	13	5	3.73	1382/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	8	8	5	3.42	1293/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	7	7	4	3.74	1334/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	7	6	9	4.09	708/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1140/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	7	6	7	3.48	1450/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	1	9	5	2	3.33	1444/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	7	5	7	3.61	1460/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	9	3	9	3.83	1520/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	7	8	5	3.61	1371/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	1284/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	3	1	3	4	1	2.92	1264/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	6	8	5	3.40	1221/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	1274/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	4	7	7	4	3.29	1361/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	2	4	7	7	3.57	712/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0207
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 279
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0207
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 280
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	0	7	6	12	4.08	1139/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	13	5	3.73	1382/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	8	8	5	3.42	1293/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	7	7	4	3.74	1334/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	7	6	9	4.09	708/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1140/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	7	6	7	3.48	1450/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1297/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	171/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1142/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	850/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	612/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	489/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	6	8	5	3.40	1221/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	1274/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	4	7	7	4	3.29	1361/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	2	4	7	7	3.57	712/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0207
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 280
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0208
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 281
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	8	5	3	3.25	1583/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	8	2	3.30	1568/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	6	2	2.95	1374/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1587/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	5	3	3	5	3.50	1223/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1509/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	1	6	6	3.45	1463/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	10	3	0	3.07	1531/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	4	2	9	3.65	1445/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	5	5	6	3.65	1540/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	8	4	6	0	2.70	1553/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	4	8	2	1	2.50	1547/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	1	4	4	1	2.92	1259/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	4	5	3	1	2.35	1487/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	6	8	1	3.15	1403/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	5	2	7	2	2.90	1447/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	5	1	5	3	4	3.00	881/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0208
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 282
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	8	5	3	3.25	1583/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	8	2	3.30	1568/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	6	2	2.95	1374/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1587/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	5	3	3	5	3.50	1223/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1509/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	1	6	6	3.45	1463/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	7	4	2	3.27	1470/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	0	5	10	4.11	1243/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	1392/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	3	5	4	3.16	1487/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	3	2	3	5	3.12	1472/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	7	0	3	3	6	3.05	1212/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	4	5	3	1	2.35	1487/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	6	8	1	3.15	1403/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	5	2	7	2	2.90	1447/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	5	1	5	3	4	3.00	881/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0209
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 283
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	8	6	7	3.78	1393/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	7	7	3.87	1298/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	7	5	3.43	1290/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1399/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	9	5	3.89	916/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	836/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	7	8	3.74	1338/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	6	5	3	3.28	1466/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	6	5	11	4.09	1260/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	4	14	4.30	1374/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	8	3	8	3.57	1385/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	8	7	3.78	1274/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	3	7	7	3.89	803/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	6	8	6	3.61	1129/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	5	4	14	4.39	768/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	6	4	9	3.70	1253/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	4	1	2	4	9	3.65	680/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0209
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 283
 JAN 21, 2006
 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 1	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 2		
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 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0209
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 284
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	8	6	7	3.78	1393/1674	3.55	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	7	7	3.87	1298/1674	3.53	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	7	5	3.43	1290/1423	3.03	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1399/1609	3.07	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	9	5	3.89	916/1585	3.63	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	836/1535	3.15	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	7	8	3.74	1338/1651	3.67	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	635/1673	4.95	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	805/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	618/1586	4.18	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	689/1585	4.29	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	1079/1582	3.59	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	1138/1575	3.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	472/1380	3.40	3.62	3.94	3.78	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	6	8	6	3.61	1129/1520	3.14	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	5	4	14	4.39	768/1515	3.84	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	6	4	9	3.70	1253/1511	3.62	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	4	1	2	4	9	3.65	680/ 994	3.39	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	2.92	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	3.31	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	4.22	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	3.00	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	3.33	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.33	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.50	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	2.71	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	2.33	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	2.94	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	3.13	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.71	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	3.17	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0209
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 284
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.
 Enrollment: 226
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 285
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	0	1	2	10	33	38	4.25	954/1674	4.25	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	30	46	4.44	673/1674	4.44	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	5	31	46	4.46	636/1423	4.46	3.53	4.27	4.16	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	68	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	****/1609	****	3.67	4.22	4.05	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	0	10	24	40	4.36	452/1585	4.36	3.69	3.96	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	65	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	****/1535	****	3.77	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	20	56	4.55	471/1651	4.55	3.82	4.18	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	8	74	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	0	6	34	31	4.31	655/1656	4.31	3.66	4.07	3.96	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	19	61	4.70	618/1586	4.70	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	9	73	4.87	664/1585	4.87	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	24	55	4.62	496/1582	4.62	3.81	4.26	4.17	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	1	8	21	49	4.49	704/1575	4.49	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	42	5	5	8	6	16	3.58	1009/1380	3.58	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	61	0	4	2	2	11	6	3.52	1161/1520	3.52	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	62	0	2	1	5	9	7	3.75	1209/1515	3.75	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	62	0	3	4	5	7	5	3.29	1361/1511	3.29	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	62	13	2	1	3	4	1	3.09	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	83	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 278	****	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	83	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	84	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	84	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	84	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	84	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	84	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	84	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	85	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	85	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	85	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	84	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	84	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	84	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	84	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	84	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.
 Enrollment: 226
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 285
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 3	A 20	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	22	1.00-1.99 0	B 33		
56-83	18	2.00-2.99 11	C 25	General 1	Under-grad 86 Non-major 84
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 16	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 74	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0201
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 286
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	2	3	5	6	4	3.35	1558/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	7	3	2	2.75	1646/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	2	2	3	3	2.93	1381/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	2	5	4	3.40	1484/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	865/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	1328/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	1403/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	4	7	1	2	2.81	1590/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	2	4	5	5	3.25	1522/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	0	5	7	5	3.55	1549/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	5	2	6	3	2.95	1517/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	1	3	6	2	2.65	1539/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	845/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	0	4	3	2	2.67	1453/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	9	1	4	0	1	1.87	1500/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	8	1	2	3	1	2.20	1491/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	11	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	214/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	241/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	168/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	246/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	210/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.42	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0201
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Zhang, Hailang (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 287
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	2	3	5	6	4	3.35	1558/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	7	3	2	2.75	1646/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	2	2	3	3	2.93	1381/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	2	5	4	3.40	1484/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	865/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	1328/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	1403/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	3	7	2	1	3.08	1530/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	3	5	0	4	3.23	1524/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	2	2	7	2	3.50	1552/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	6	4	2	2	3.00	1504/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	4	3	2	2.93	1511/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	0	4	3	2	2.67	1453/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	9	1	4	0	1	1.87	1500/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	8	1	2	3	1	2.20	1491/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	11	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	214/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	241/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	168/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	246/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	210/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.42	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 288
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	5	2	5	1	2.56	1663/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	2.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	3	6	1	2.78	1644/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	4	3	2	3	2.87	1391/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	2	3	5	2	2.82	1586/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	1181/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	5	6	1	3.13	1423/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	3	1	5	3	2.78	1597/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	9	2	0	2.79	1595/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	3	6	5	3.50	1480/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	4	5	4	3.33	1564/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	7	4	1	2.78	1546/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	5	5	0	2.56	1545/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	4	2	0	1	0	1.71	1371/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	1.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	0	4	2	0	2.40	1481/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	4	3	1	1	0	1.89	1499/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	1	0	1	1	2.00	1495/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	6	0	4	7	1	2.83	262/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	2.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	258/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.06	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	163/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.39	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	220/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.72	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	3	3	6	2	4	3.06	220/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.06	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 288
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	A 2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	10	B 9			
56-83	2	C 6	General	0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
		P 0			
		I 0	Other	16	
		? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Keating, Loryn (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 289
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	5	2	5	1	2.56	1663/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	2.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	3	6	1	2.78	1644/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	4	3	2	3	2.87	1391/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	2	3	5	2	2.82	1586/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	1181/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	5	6	1	3.13	1423/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	3	1	5	3	2.78	1597/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	6	2	0	2.90	1581/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1487/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1532/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	2	5	2	0	2.64	1560/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	1	3	3	0	2.45	1550/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1368/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	1.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	0	4	2	0	2.40	1481/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	4	3	1	1	0	1.89	1499/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	1	0	1	1	2.00	1495/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	6	0	4	7	1	2.83	262/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	2.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	258/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.06	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	163/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.39	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	220/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.72	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	3	3	6	2	4	3.06	220/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.06	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Keating, Loryn (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 289
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	A 2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	10	B 9			
56-83	2	C 6	General	0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
		P 0			
		I 0	Other	16	
		? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 290
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	0	8	4	1	3.00	1628/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	6	1	3.31	1565/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	5	1	0	2.67	1405/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1360/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1066/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	840/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	1	3	6	3.53	1430/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	1072/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	7	2	0	2.77	1598/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	3.50	1480/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1561/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	6	5	4	1	3.00	1504/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	5	2	2	2.69	1537/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	1366/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	1.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	2	0	1	2.25	1496/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1470/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	0	1	1	2.38	1485/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	229/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	204/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	196/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.21	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	163/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.23	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	206/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.54	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Ganguly, Soumya (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 291
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	0	8	4	1	3.00	1628/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	6	1	3.31	1565/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	5	1	0	2.67	1405/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1360/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1066/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	840/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	1	3	6	3.53	1430/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	1072/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1399/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1460/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1532/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1480/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1528/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1359/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	1.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	2	0	1	2.25	1496/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1470/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	0	1	1	2.38	1485/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	229/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	204/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	196/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.21	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	163/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.23	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	206/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.54	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0501
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 292
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	5	6	1	1	2.41	1667/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	2.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	7	2	3	0	2.18	1669/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	8	3	1	1	0	1.62	1423/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	1.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	6	2	4	1	2.86	1583/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	4	4	3	0	2.40	1553/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	2.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	4	3	1	2.86	1478/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	5	4	2	0	2.19	1632/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	987/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	5	4	2	0	2.46	1622/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	5	6	0	3.07	1534/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	1547/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	5	3	0	2.64	1559/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	7	4	0	3	0	1.93	1567/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	1.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1314/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	1442/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	0	1	0	1.71	1506/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1482/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	229/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	4	3	2	1	3.00	259/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	235/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	4	0	4	3.60	228/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	3	2	4	0	2.90	224/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	2.90	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	1	17
			Other	14	Non-major
					0
					17
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0501
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Keating, Loryn (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 293
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	5	6	1	1	2.41	1667/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	2.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	7	2	3	0	2.18	1669/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	8	3	1	1	0	1.62	1423/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	1.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	6	2	4	1	2.86	1583/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	4	4	3	0	2.40	1553/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	2.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	4	3	1	2.86	1478/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	5	4	2	0	2.19	1632/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	2.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	987/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	5	0	1	2.67	1610/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	2	4	0	0	2.43	1576/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1571/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	3	3	0	0	2.29	1574/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	0	1	0	1.67	1572/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	1.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	1442/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	0	1	0	1.71	1506/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1482/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	229/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	4	3	2	1	3.00	259/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	235/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	4	0	4	3.60	228/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	3	2	4	0	2.90	224/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	2.90	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	1	17
			Other	14	Non-major
					0
					17
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 294
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	1	3	8	5	3.68	1439/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	1111/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1237/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	1	3	3	6	3.50	1452/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	769/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	797/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	3	8	3.78	1310/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	1203/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1455/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1412/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	1544/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	8	3	6	3.78	1290/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	6	5	3.65	1336/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1196/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	777/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	944/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	0	6	3.70	1249/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	614/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	141/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	142/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	145/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.46	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	148/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.31	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	132/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	4.15	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 294
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Vokkaliga, Smit (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 295
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	1	3	8	5	3.68	1439/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	1111/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1237/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	1	3	3	6	3.50	1452/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	769/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	797/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	3	8	3.78	1310/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	1203/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1124/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1074/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1502/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1070/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1138/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	540/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	777/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	944/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	0	6	3.70	1249/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	614/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	141/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	142/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	145/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.46	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	148/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.31	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	132/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	4.15	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Vokkaliga, Smit (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 295
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 296
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	7	5	1	3.00	1628/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	4	1	2.95	1623/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	4	3	1	2.83	1395/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1525/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	4	5	2	3.13	1411/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1374/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	4	6	3.61	1398/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	742/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	12	1	2	3.06	1533/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	8	1	5	3.21	1526/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	9	1	4	3.11	1573/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	7	1	4	2.95	1519/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	5	3	3	2.74	1533/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1480/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	3	0	1	2.57	1473/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	252/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	4	6	3	1	2.71	270/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	2.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	229/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	1	3	3	6	3.35	242/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.35	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	215/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.31	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 296
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	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	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Mendez, Miguel (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 297
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	7	5	1	3.00	1628/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	4	1	2.95	1623/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	2.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	4	3	1	2.83	1395/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1525/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	4	5	2	3.13	1411/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1374/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	4	6	3.61	1398/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	742/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	7	3	0	3.18	1500/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	6	0	2	3.22	1525/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1572/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1533/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	2.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1545/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1480/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	3	0	1	2.57	1473/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	252/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	4	6	3	1	2.71	270/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	2.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	229/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	3.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	1	3	3	6	3.35	242/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.35	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	215/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.31	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Mendez, Miguel (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 297
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	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	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0801
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 298
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1155/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	8	3.63	1436/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	5	2	1	7	3.35	1311/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	4	2	6	3.67	1377/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	1	5	7	3.88	926/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	1092/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	2	2	8	3.47	1454/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	424/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	3	2	7	0	3.15	1510/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	4	4	8	3.89	1376/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	3	2	10	4.06	1463/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	4	8	3.89	1228/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	1090/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	3	1	0	3	3.43	1082/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1068/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	1414/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1405/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	591/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	6	2	9	4.00	178/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	8	2	7	3.78	221/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	195/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.22	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	142/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	7	0	5	1	5	2.83	228/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	2.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0801
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 298
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 15		
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0801
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Zhang, Hailang (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 299
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1155/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	8	3.63	1436/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	5	2	1	7	3.35	1311/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	4	2	6	3.67	1377/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	1	5	7	3.88	926/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	1092/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	2	2	8	3.47	1454/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	424/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	451/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1217/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	1322/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	956/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1050/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	3	1	0	2	3.17	1190/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1068/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	1414/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1405/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	591/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	6	2	9	4.00	178/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	8	2	7	3.78	221/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	195/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.22	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	142/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	7	0	5	1	5	2.83	228/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	2.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0801
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Zhang, Hailang (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 299
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 300
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	1	10	7	0	3.21	1592/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	10	6	1	3.32	1565/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1284/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	9	4	2	3.35	1495/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	6	6	3	3.50	1223/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	5	7	1	3.40	1332/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	6	1	3.17	1544/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	832/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	5	6	3	3.47	1390/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	11	1	3.58	1466/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	8	6	3	3.47	1554/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	12	0	3.53	1399/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	4	9	2	3.26	1442/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	5	2	3	0	2.64	1307/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	5	6	0	3.55	1153/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	5	1	1	2.73	1463/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	1447/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	212/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.76	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	210/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	171/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.35	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	3	7	5	3.76	218/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.76	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	8	6	2	3.53	207/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.53	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 300
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Vokkaliga, Smit (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 301
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	1	10	7	0	3.21	1592/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	10	6	1	3.32	1565/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1284/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	9	4	2	3.35	1495/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	6	6	3	3.50	1223/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	5	7	1	3.40	1332/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	6	1	3.17	1544/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	832/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	7	5	1	3.33	1444/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	6	7	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	8	5	2	3.35	1563/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	3.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	4	7	0	2.94	1519/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	6	4	2	3.06	1480/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	4	1	3	0	2.67	1304/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	5	6	0	3.55	1153/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	5	1	1	2.73	1463/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	2.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	1447/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	2.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	212/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	3.76	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	210/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	171/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.35	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	3	7	5	3.76	218/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	3.76	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	8	6	2	3.53	207/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.53	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Vokkaliga, Smit (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 301
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 302
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1131/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1319/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1342/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1278/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1164/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	0	5	1	3.63	1229/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1345/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1040/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	1	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1391/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1539/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1486/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1414/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1351/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1481/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1508/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1507/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	1.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	93/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	86/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	62/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	188/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 302
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	7				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Ganuly, Soumya (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 303
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1131/1674	3.26	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1319/1674	3.20	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1342/1423	2.95	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1278/1609	3.37	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1164/1585	3.53	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	0	5	1	3.63	1229/1535	3.53	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1345/1651	3.32	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	1040/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1656	3.24	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	1074/1586	3.52	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1158/1585	3.62	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	935/1582	3.23	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	806/1575	3.05	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1324/1380	2.70	3.62	3.94	3.78	2.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1481/1520	2.98	3.40	4.01	3.76	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1508/1515	2.45	3.53	4.24	3.97	1.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1507/1511	2.56	3.57	4.27	4.00	1.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	93/ 265	3.71	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	86/ 278	3.63	4.08	4.19	3.97	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	62/ 259	3.92	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	188/ 233	3.39	4.02	4.20	4.00	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: Ganuly, Soumya (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 303
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	7				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 123 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM
 Instructor: GEIRASCH, TIFFA
 Enrollment: 123
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 304
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	1	7	19	18	15	3.65	1454/1674	3.65	3.87	4.27	4.07	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	9	15	21	15	3.61	1446/1674	3.61	3.76	4.23	4.16	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	8	20	20	7	3.27	1330/1423	3.27	3.53	4.27	4.16	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	24	4	5	11	9	7	3.28	1513/1609	3.28	3.67	4.22	4.05	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	4	3	11	22	9	3.59	1169/1585	3.59	3.69	3.96	3.88	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	3	3	8	7	4	3.24	1390/1535	3.24	3.77	4.08	3.89	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	1	6	12	21	16	3.80	1289/1651	3.80	3.82	4.18	4.10	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	8	50	4.81	868/1673	4.81	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	2	8	19	13	6	3.27	1466/1656	3.27	3.66	4.07	3.96	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	5	16	35	4.41	1004/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.37	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	13	44	4.66	1083/1585	4.66	4.30	4.69	4.60	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	5	22	17	11	3.48	1413/1582	3.48	3.81	4.26	4.17	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	12	18	24	3.98	1153/1575	3.98	3.70	4.27	4.17	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	5	8	16	26	4.09	630/1380	4.09	3.62	3.94	3.78	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	2	3	5	5	4	3.32	1261/1520	3.32	3.40	4.01	3.76	3.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	2	2	6	4	5	3.42	1333/1515	3.42	3.53	4.24	3.97	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	1	1	5	8	4	3.68	1257/1511	3.68	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	44	4	1	1	6	1	5	3.57	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.08	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	4.41	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	4.19	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 123 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM
 Instructor: GEIRASCH, TIFFA
 Enrollment: 123
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 304
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	19	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	5						
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	55				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 305
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	950/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1500/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1146/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	874/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	850/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	983/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	363/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	170/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	4	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: Katz, Civia (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 306
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	950/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1500/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1431/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1442/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1472/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	170/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 9
84-150	4	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 9		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: Turner, Kevin (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 307
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	950/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1500/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	849/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1309/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	170/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 9
84-150	4	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 9		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 308
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1353/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1394/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	3	3.36	1311/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	6	6	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1339/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	858/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	853/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	1	4	5	3.64	1355/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1309/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	303/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	172/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	137/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	171/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: Jenkins, Daniel (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 309
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1353/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1394/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	3	3.36	1311/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	6	6	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	794/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1300/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1524/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1406/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1458/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	172/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	137/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	171/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: See, Bee Koon (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 310
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1353/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1394/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	3	3.36	1311/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	6	6	4.00	769/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	900/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1300/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1546/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1406/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1458/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	172/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	137/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	171/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0103
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 311
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	4	2	4.00	1196/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1043/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1016/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1377/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1084/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1258/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1177/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	689/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1244/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	1309/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	866/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1284/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1050/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	155/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	72/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	159/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	184/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0103
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: Jenkins, Daniel (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 312
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	4	2	4.00	1196/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1043/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1016/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1377/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1084/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1258/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1200/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1284/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1050/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	155/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	72/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	159/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	184/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0103
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: Turner, Kevin (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 313
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	4	2	4.00	1196/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1043/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1016/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1377/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1084/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1258/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1330/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1284/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1050/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	155/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	72/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	159/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	184/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 314
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1611/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1499/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1389/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	2.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1525/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1009/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	0	4	0	0	2.33	1631/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	723/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	917/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	1448/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	3	1	3.25	1445/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	4	1	1	2	3.13	1202/1380	3.96	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1453/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1361/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1351/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	146/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	211/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	190/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	62/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: Katz, Civia (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 315
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1611/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1499/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1389/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	2.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1525/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1009/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1297/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1354/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	850/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1453/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1361/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1351/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	146/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	211/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	190/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	62/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 7
84-150	5	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 7		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: See, Bee Koon (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 316
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1611/1674	3.80	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1499/1674	3.84	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1389/1423	3.59	3.53	4.27	4.27	2.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1609	3.72	3.67	4.22	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1525/1585	3.61	3.69	3.96	3.95	2.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.17	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1009/1651	4.11	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1656	3.76	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.41	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1354/1585	4.30	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	692/1575	3.90	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1453/1520	2.96	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1361/1515	3.79	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1351/1511	3.67	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	146/ 265	4.26	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	211/ 278	4.24	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	190/ 260	4.73	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	62/ 259	4.47	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.39	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	5	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	7				
				? 1						

Course-Section: CHEM 301 0101
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 317
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	0	2	13	20	4.51	594/1674	4.51	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	23	4.57	495/1674	4.57	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	9	24	4.57	493/1423	4.57	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	892/1609	4.23	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	11	8	11	3.88	936/1585	3.88	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	319/1535	4.57	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	2	4	26	4.64	361/1651	4.64	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	14	14	4.37	575/1656	4.37	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	28	4.76	496/1586	4.76	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	11	20	4.48	661/1582	4.48	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	8	24	4.59	601/1575	4.59	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	2	1	9	2	3	3.18	1187/1380	3.18	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	912/1520	3.92	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	2	1	1	1	7	3.83	1177/1511	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 35	Non-major 26
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 26		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 318
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	4	5	4.08	1139/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1312/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1155/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1035/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	722/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	870/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1317/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1246/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1177/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1260/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1158/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1208/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	0	5	3.42	1398/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	2.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1082/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	865/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 994	3.60	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	178/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	122/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	210/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.13	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	208/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	201/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	13
			Other	11	Non-major
					10
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: Ke, Haohao (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 319
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	4	5	4.08	1139/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1312/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1155/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1035/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	722/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	870/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1317/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1246/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	1486/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1415/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1397/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1406/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1559/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	2.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	865/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 994	3.60	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	178/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	122/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	210/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.13	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	208/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	201/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	13
			Other	11	Non-major
					10
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: Chandrasekhra (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 320
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	4	5	4.08	1139/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1312/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1155/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1035/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	722/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	870/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1317/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1246/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	6	0	0	2.56	1618/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1562/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1568/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	2.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	865/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 994	3.60	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	178/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	122/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	210/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.13	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	208/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	201/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 321
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	7	6	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1104/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1006/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	737/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1188/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1114/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	1090/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1270/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	664/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	1190/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1264/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	666/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1010/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	172/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.15	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	244/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.62	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	177/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.15	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	6	0	5	3.62	202/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.62	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: Ke, Haoha (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 322
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	7	6	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1104/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1006/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	737/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1188/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1114/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1260/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1427/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1441/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1129/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	1355/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1010/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	172/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.15	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	244/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.62	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	177/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.15	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	6	0	5	3.62	202/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.62	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: Chandrasekhra (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 323
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	7	6	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1104/1674	3.95	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.15	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	598/1609	4.26	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1006/1585	3.94	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	737/1535	4.10	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1188/1651	3.85	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1114/1673	4.54	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	4	4	0	2.83	1588/1656	3.35	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1466/1586	3.66	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1515/1585	4.16	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1434/1582	3.63	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	0	1	2	3.00	1487/1575	3.21	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1010/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.17	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.25	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.27	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	172/ 278	4.26	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.15	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	244/ 260	3.87	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.62	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	177/ 259	4.01	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.15	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	6	0	5	3.62	202/ 233	3.62	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.62	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	7	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	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L
 Enrollment: 153
 Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 324
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	5	11	19	31	4.01	1187/1674	4.24	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.01	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	18	24	20	3.77	1364/1674	4.14	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	9	14	21	22	3.72	1184/1423	4.03	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	53	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	****/1609	****	3.67	4.22	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	11	17	31	4.17	632/1585	4.32	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	51	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	****/1535	****	3.77	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	7	11	27	20	3.75	1324/1651	4.09	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	67	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	3	21	19	14	3.77	1222/1656	4.05	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	14	18	30	4.03	1290/1586	4.36	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	4	14	48	4.57	1166/1585	4.68	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	3	20	21	18	3.62	1367/1582	3.95	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	7	13	23	19	3.62	1346/1575	4.04	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	35	1	4	11	10	6	3.50	1036/1380	3.55	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	5	0	5	10	5	3.40	1221/1520	3.17	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	1	1	11	6	7	3.65	1256/1515	3.64	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	4	1	5	7	9	3.62	1286/1511	3.69	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	44	18	0	3	0	0	4	3.71	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 278	****	4.08	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	63	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 260	****	4.41	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.19	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L
 Enrollment: 153
 Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 324
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4 Major 4
28-55	14	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 5	C 11	General 0	Under-grad 65 Non-major 65
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 60		
			? 4		

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN
 Enrollment: 242
 Questionnaires: 117

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 325
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	0	1	5	8	24	74	4.47	655/1674	4.24	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	4	6	31	71	4.51	578/1674	4.14	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	1	5	10	34	61	4.34	760/1423	4.03	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	84	1	4	5	6	12	3.86	****/1609	****	3.67	4.22	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	24	1	3	7	20	57	4.47	360/1585	4.32	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	91	3	0	4	6	7	3.70	****/1535	****	3.77	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	10	35	64	4.43	643/1651	4.09	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	2	15	95	4.83	832/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	3	1	0	9	33	39	4.33	628/1656	4.05	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	5	22	82	4.68	633/1586	4.36	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	2	14	92	4.78	853/1585	4.68	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	5	11	41	51	4.28	914/1582	3.95	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	2	11	29	64	4.46	742/1575	4.04	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	14	4	7	37	18	26	3.60	1001/1380	3.55	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	82	0	8	5	9	7	6	2.94	1390/1520	3.17	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	85	0	4	2	6	10	10	3.63	1267/1515	3.64	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	84	0	2	5	6	6	14	3.76	1221/1511	3.69	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	82	24	2	3	0	3	3	3.18	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	104	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	106	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	****/ 278	****	4.08	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	106	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.73	****/ 260	****	4.41	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	106	2	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	****/ 259	****	4.19	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	106	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	111	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	112	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	112	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	112	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	113	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	113	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	113	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	113	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	113	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	113	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	113	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	113	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	113	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN
 Enrollment: 242
 Questionnaires: 117

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 325
 JAN 21, 2006
 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 34	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	31	1.00-1.99 0	B 34		
56-83	22	2.00-2.99 9	C 18	General 0	Under-grad 117 Non-major 113
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 14	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 40	F 1	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0		
			Other 101		
			? 10		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 326
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	1511/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	2	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	2	3	3.00	1363/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1536/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	1260/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1223/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	1	4	3.58	1410/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	0	5	3	1	2.92	1576/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1168/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	1472/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1493/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1538/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	489/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1169/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1420/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	207/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	233/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	199/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	171/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: Cai, Hongyi (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 327
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	1511/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	2	3	3.33	1559/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	2	3	3.00	1363/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1536/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	1260/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1223/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	1	4	3.58	1410/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1139/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1397/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1302/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1138/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1169/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1420/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	207/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	233/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	199/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	171/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	61/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK A (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 328
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	6	4.55	558/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1009/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1107/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	645/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	512/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	215/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	727/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1124/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	704/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	857/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1361/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	51/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.70	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	72/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	63/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	45/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	72/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: bhari, Moshen (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 329
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	6	4.55	558/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1009/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1107/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	645/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	512/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	215/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	727/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1297/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1237/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1448/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1240/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	295/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1361/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	51/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.70	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	72/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	63/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	45/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	72/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK H (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 330
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	8	4	4.08	1139/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1446/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1252/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1266/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1372/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	8	2	3.75	1147/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1214/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1280/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	336/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	3	4	3.38	1408/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1065/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1303/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	4	1	3	3.09	1414/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1405/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	104/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	115/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK H (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 330
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: olewinski,Ron (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 331
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	8	4	4.08	1139/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1446/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1252/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1266/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1372/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	8	2	3.75	1147/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1214/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	655/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1104/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	1506/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	850/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1090/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1303/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	4	1	3	3.09	1414/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1405/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	104/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	115/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: olewinski,Ron (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 331
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK D (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 332
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	5	3	3.91	1322/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1271/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1287/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	1435/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	996/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	870/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1485/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	871/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	931/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1267/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	914/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	0	6	3.82	1259/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	626/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1010/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	1209/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1243/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	227/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	188/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	3	0	1	3	4	3.45	247/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.45	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	3	0	2	3	3	3.27	245/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.27	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	169/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	10	
?	1			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: aphnis, Suze (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 333
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	5	3	3.91	1322/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1271/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1287/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	1435/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	996/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	870/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1485/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1377/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1558/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1515/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1381/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1556/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1127/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1010/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	1209/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1243/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	699/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	227/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	188/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	3	0	1	3	4	3.45	247/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	3.45	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	3	0	2	3	3	3.27	245/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.27	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	169/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	10	
?	1			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 334
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	8	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	578/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	540/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	552/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	769/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	643/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1264/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	655/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	319/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	394/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	359/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	284/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	760/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1349/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1340/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	474/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	74/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	35/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	130/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	93/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 334
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: un, Jian (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 335
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	8	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	578/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	540/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	552/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	769/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	643/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1264/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1415/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1118/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1448/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1343/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	760/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1349/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1340/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	474/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	74/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	35/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	130/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	93/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: un, Jian (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 335
JAN 21, 2006
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 336
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	0	2	8	4.15	1066/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1364/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	968/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	0	3	6	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	966/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1083/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1050/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1139/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	738/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	1130/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	956/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	4	6	3.92	1200/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	505/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	355/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1328/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	46/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	57/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	129/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	142/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	41/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 336
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: hu, Guozhang (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 337
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	0	2	8	4.15	1066/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1364/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	968/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	0	3	6	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	966/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1083/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1050/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	849/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	858/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1328/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	632/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1080/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	355/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1328/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	46/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	57/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	129/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	142/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	41/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: hu, Guozhang (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 337
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK H (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 338
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	5	4	3.85	1359/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	956/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1231/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1435/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1156/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	747/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1097/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1139/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	989/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	737/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1040/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	472/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1169/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1485/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1050/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	66/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	44/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	60/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	72/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	57/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK H (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 338
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: olewinski,Ron (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 339
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	5	4	3.85	1359/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	956/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1231/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1435/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1156/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	747/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1097/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	882/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	663/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1434/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	704/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	819/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	902/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1169/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1485/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1050/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	66/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	44/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	60/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	72/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	57/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: olewinski,Ron (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 339
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0801
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 340
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	7	4	4.08	1139/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1173/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1035/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1100/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1140/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1097/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1260/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	826/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	896/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	690/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1050/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	859/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1221/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1341/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1291/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	196/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	120/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	148/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.31	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	144/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.08	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0801
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: otel, Billy (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 341
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	7	4	4.08	1139/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1146/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1173/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1035/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1100/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1140/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1097/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	352/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	931/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1335/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	589/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1020/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	998/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1221/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1341/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1291/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	196/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	120/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	94/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	148/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.31	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	144/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.08	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0901
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK A (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 342
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	558/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	790/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	901/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	645/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	996/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	548/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	843/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1222/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1128/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	914/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1103/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	827/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	106/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	80/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	86/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	96/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	82/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0901
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: bhari, Moshen (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 343
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	558/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	790/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	901/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	645/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	996/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	548/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	843/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	955/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1120/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1225/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	850/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1040/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	827/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	106/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	80/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	86/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	96/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	82/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1001
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK D (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 344
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	6	2	3.67	1449/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	3.42	1535/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1323/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1285/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	907/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	767/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1214/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	9	1	3.75	1237/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	663/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1367/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	2.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	489/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1252/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1452/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1265/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	178/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	137/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	175/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	248/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	169/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1001
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: aphnis, Suze (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 345
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	2	6	2	3.67	1449/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	3.42	1535/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1323/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1285/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	907/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	767/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1214/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1528/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1400/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1569/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	6	1	2	3.30	1464/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	3	2	0	2.44	1550/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	2.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1217/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1252/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1452/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1265/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	178/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	137/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	175/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	248/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	169/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK C (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 346
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	5	4.00	1196/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1104/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1016/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	715/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	6	4	3.73	1066/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	9	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1057/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	955/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	723/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	690/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1080/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	10	3	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1461/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	4	1	0	2.50	1470/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1466/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	146/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	130/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	122/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.58	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	212/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	143/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.08	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: ai, Hongyi (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 347
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	5	4.00	1196/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1104/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1016/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	715/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	6	4	3.73	1066/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	9	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1057/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	1399/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1054/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	1383/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1434/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	7	3	3.64	1336/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	810/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1461/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	4	1	0	2.50	1470/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1466/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	146/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	130/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	122/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.58	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	212/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	3.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	143/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.08	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 348
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	1066/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1484/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	1	6	2	3.42	1296/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1360/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	976/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	1	2	5	3.55	1273/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1377/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	1001/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1237/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	1044/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	0	1	9	4.25	1397/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	2	1	6	3.58	1378/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	1	2	6	3.67	1329/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	131/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1027/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1267/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1155/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	932/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	2.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	74/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	199/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	171/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	124/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 348
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: otel, Billy (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 349
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	1066/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1484/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	1	6	2	3.42	1296/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1360/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	976/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	1	2	5	3.55	1273/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1377/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	1001/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	106/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	753/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1423/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	777/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	1010/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1027/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1267/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1155/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	932/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	2.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	74/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	199/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	171/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	124/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: otel, Billy (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 349
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 350
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	891/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	870/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	718/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	490/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	575/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	836/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	889/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	849/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	737/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	850/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	806/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	463/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	132/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	57/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	77/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	89/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	66/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	11	Non-major
					13
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: alim, Samir (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 351
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	891/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	870/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	718/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	490/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	575/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	836/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	889/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	635/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	214/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	945/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	847/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	132/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	57/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	77/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	89/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	66/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0					
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	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	11			
				? 1					

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 352
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	10	4.39	792/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	8	5	3.83	1319/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	980/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	7	6	3.94	1185/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	2	8	3.82	986/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	494/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1240/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	871/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	453/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	615/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	1070/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	940/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	303/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	512/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	81/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.54	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	81/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.69	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	97/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: PERKS, H MARK B (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 352
JAN 21, 2006
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: akke, Brian (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 353
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	10	4.39	792/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	8	5	3.83	1319/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	980/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	7	6	3.94	1185/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	2	8	3.82	986/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	494/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1240/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	1073/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	1168/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	1335/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	914/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	1010/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	512/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	81/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.54	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	81/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.69	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	97/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: akke, Brian (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 353
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 354
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	10	4.39	792/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	8	5	3.83	1319/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	980/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	7	6	3.94	1185/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	2	8	3.82	986/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	494/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1240/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	860/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	663/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	692/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	512/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	563/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	87/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.54	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	81/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.54	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	81/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.69	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	97/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 354
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK Z (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 355
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	6	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	870/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1228/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	615/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	618/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	882/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1264/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	622/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1252/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1361/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1265/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	142/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	52/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	127/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	134/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: hu, Guozhang (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 356
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	6	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	870/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1228/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	955/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1529/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1367/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1252/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1361/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1265/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	142/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	52/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	127/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	134/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 357
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1309/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	1146/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1214/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1042/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1223/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	0	5	3.45	1313/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1324/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	871/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1074/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1191/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1129/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1384/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	549/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1488/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1167/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1177/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	847/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	178/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	226/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	201/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.18	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	185/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	150/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 357
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: un, Jian (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 358
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1309/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	1146/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1214/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1042/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1223/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	0	5	3.45	1313/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1324/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	5	0	3.57	1344/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1224/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1383/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1381/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1309/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	902/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1488/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1167/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1177/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	847/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	178/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	226/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	201/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.18	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	185/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	150/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: un, Jian (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 358
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 359
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	4	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	672/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1242/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	769/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	807/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1246/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	849/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	723/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	917/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	632/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	692/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	227/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1129/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1180/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1050/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	676/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	132/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	170/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	175/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	142/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	130/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.17	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: adler, Josh (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 360
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	4	4.50	607/1674	4.16	3.87	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1674	3.99	3.76	4.23	4.21	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	672/1423	3.86	3.53	4.27	4.27	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1242/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.27	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	769/1585	3.78	3.69	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	807/1535	4.05	3.77	4.08	4.15	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1246/1651	3.93	3.82	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.89	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1237/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1300/1586	4.39	4.17	4.43	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1472/1585	4.46	4.30	4.69	4.66	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	850/1582	4.13	3.81	4.26	4.26	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	886/1575	3.91	3.70	4.27	4.25	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	666/1380	4.06	3.62	3.94	4.01	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1129/1520	3.68	3.40	4.01	4.09	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1180/1515	3.48	3.53	4.24	4.32	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1050/1511	3.74	3.57	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	676/ 994	3.46	3.46	3.94	3.96	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	132/ 265	4.34	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	170/ 278	4.37	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	175/ 260	4.54	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	142/ 259	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.33	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	130/ 233	4.30	4.02	4.20	4.18	4.17	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 405 0101
 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: ~~SZALAI, VERONIK~~ Thyagarajan, Sunita
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 361
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	8	12	4.15	1066/1674	4.15	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	12	6	3.77	1364/1674	3.77	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	12	6	3.69	1197/1423	3.69	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	2	9	1	3.77	1313/1609	3.77	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	5	5	4	3.19	1388/1585	3.19	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1083/1535	3.83	3.77	4.08	4.18	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	5	8	9	3.84	1264/1651	3.84	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	283/1673	4.96	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	3	5	10	2	3.55	1353/1656	3.55	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	2	7	12	4.13	1237/1586	4.13	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	3	10	7	3.79	1278/1582	3.79	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	992/1575	4.22	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1205/1380	3.11	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	780/1520	4.09	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	798/1515	4.36	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	955/1511	4.20	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	346/ 994	4.29	3.46	3.94	4.19	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 2	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 6 Major 19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 21	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 420 0101
 Title COMUPTE APPL IN CHEM
 Instructor: GREGURICK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 362
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	11	4.57	521/1674	4.57	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	338/1674	4.69	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1423	4.80	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1609	4.91	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.67	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	145/1651	4.86	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	437/1656	4.46	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	366/1582	4.71	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	523/1575	4.64	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1027/1520	3.75	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	898/1515	4.25	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	642/1511	4.50	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.08	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.41	4.46	4.24	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 2	Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 12	Non-major 1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 433 0101
 Title BIOCHEM OF NUCLEIC ACI
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 363
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	5	4.56	546/1674	4.56	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	968/1674	4.22	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	517/1423	4.56	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	926/1585	3.89	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	238/1535	4.67	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1651	4.33	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	874/1585	4.78	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	967/1582	4.22	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1575	4.78	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	629/1515	4.50	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1511	4.50	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437 0101
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM
 Instructor: CREIGHTON, DONA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 177
 Questionnaires: 117

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 364
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	9	0	0	2	15	38	53	4.31	878/1674	4.31	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	7	27	42	31	3.88	1291/1674	3.88	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	3	15	27	34	29	3.66	1220/1423	3.66	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	50	5	8	13	18	13	3.46	1468/1609	3.46	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	8	27	36	31	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	51	5	5	13	14	16	3.58	1251/1535	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.18	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	2	8	10	23	24	36	3.69	1364/1651	3.69	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	1	0	0	1	9	93	4.89	724/1673	4.89	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	4	1	1	17	32	39	4.19	805/1656	3.72	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	13	27	67	4.46	931/1586	4.44	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	3	19	85	4.74	938/1585	4.54	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	2	14	30	62	4.38	808/1582	3.99	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	5	30	70	4.53	669/1575	4.11	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	26	5	6	20	16	29	3.76	894/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	6	1	13	10	10	3.42	1210/1520	3.43	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	76	0	2	3	9	16	11	3.76	1209/1515	3.76	3.53	4.24	4.40	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	3	3	9	16	11	3.69	1253/1511	3.69	3.57	4.27	4.45	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	77	27	0	5	2	4	2	3.23	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	115	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.08	4.19	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	115	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	116	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	116	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	116	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.86	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 21	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 33		Graduate 14
56-83	14	2.00-2.99 8	C 24	General	9
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 14	D 3		Under-grad 103
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00 27	F 0	Electives	3
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	77
			? 6		

Course-Section: CHEM 437 0101
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 177
 Questionnaires: 117

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 365
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	0	2	15	38	53	4.31	878/1674	4.31	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	7	27	42	31	3.88	1291/1674	3.88	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	3	15	27	34	29	3.66	1220/1423	3.66	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	50	5	8	13	18	13	3.46	1468/1609	3.46	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	8	27	36	31	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	51	5	5	13	14	16	3.58	1251/1535	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.18	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	2	8	10	23	24	36	3.69	1364/1651	3.69	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	1	0	0	1	9	93	4.89	724/1673	4.89	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	0	10	8	30	26	12	3.26	1474/1656	3.72	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	2	11	25	58	4.41	989/1586	4.44	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	3	2	10	26	55	4.33	1354/1585	4.54	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	5	15	19	33	25	3.60	1374/1582	3.99	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	8	13	13	27	34	3.69	1318/1575	4.11	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	15	11	6	11	20	30	3.67	962/1380	3.71	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	6	1	13	10	10	3.42	1210/1520	3.43	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	76	0	2	3	9	16	11	3.76	1209/1515	3.76	3.53	4.24	4.40	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	3	3	9	16	11	3.69	1253/1511	3.69	3.57	4.27	4.45	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	77	27	0	5	2	4	2	3.23	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	115	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.08	4.19	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	115	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.11	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	116	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.50	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	116	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	116	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.78	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	3.83	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.86	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	116	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 21	Required for Majors	2	Graduate 14	Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 33				
56-83	14	2.00-2.99 8	C 24	General	9	Under-grad 103	Non-major 104
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 14	D 3				
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00 27	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 1				
			I 0	Other	77		
			? 6				

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: Lease, Richard (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 366
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	2	7	4.27	928/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1146/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1231/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	443/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1006/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	440/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1097/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1139/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	1472/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	786/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1320/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	1259/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1196/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	743/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	971/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	990/1511	3.81	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	59/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	142/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	207/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	179/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	88/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	4.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: Blocklin, Adria (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 367
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	0	2	7	4.27	928/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1146/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1231/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	443/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1006/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	440/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1097/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	465/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	784/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1002/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	903/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1138/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	743/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	971/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	990/1511	3.81	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	59/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	142/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	207/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	179/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	88/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	4.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: Lease, Richard (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 368
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	1	4	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1291/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1237/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1094/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1181/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	538/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1324/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	615/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	1144/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	5	1	3.63	1363/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1080/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	585/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	616/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	990/1511	3.81	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	141/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	235/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	107/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	176/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	3.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	56/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	55/ 101	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.65	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 95	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	3.78	4.39	4.57	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	3.83	4.14	4.46	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: Lease, Richard (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 368
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	6	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: Lin, Yun (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 369
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	1	4	4.13	1095/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1291/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1237/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1094/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1181/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	538/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1324/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	615/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1518/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1441/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1326/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	4	1	3.29	1437/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	616/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	733/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	990/1511	3.81	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	141/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	235/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	107/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	176/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	3.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	56/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	55/ 101	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.65	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 95	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	3.78	4.39	4.57	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	3.83	4.14	4.46	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.71	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	2.33	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	2.94	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.13	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.71	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.17	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: Lin, Yun (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 369
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	6	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0301
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: Lease, Richard (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 370
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1334/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1644/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1400/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	2.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1236/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	1562/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	2.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	667/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1562/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	958/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	4	2	0	2.78	1596/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	1562/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1397/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	1	2	1	2.63	1561/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	2.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	0	1	1	2.29	1558/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	2.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	1483/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	2.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1396/1511	3.81	3.57	4.27	4.45	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	202/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	272/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	2.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	150/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	232/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	3.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	3.00	221/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0301
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: Briggs, Latese (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 371
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1334/1674	4.10	3.87	4.27	4.42	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1644/1674	3.55	3.76	4.23	4.31	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1400/1423	3.35	3.53	4.27	4.34	2.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1236/1609	4.14	3.67	4.22	4.30	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	1562/1585	3.22	3.69	3.96	4.01	2.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	667/1535	4.36	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1562/1651	3.58	3.82	4.18	4.23	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	958/1673	4.92	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1237/1656	3.92	3.66	4.07	4.19	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1586	3.68	4.17	4.43	4.46	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1585	4.56	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1582	3.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	2.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1575	3.50	3.70	4.27	4.35	2.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1380	3.74	3.62	3.94	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.81	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	1483/1515	3.62	3.53	4.24	4.40	2.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1396/1511	3.81	3.57	4.27	4.45	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	202/ 265	4.28	4.13	4.23	4.53	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	272/ 278	3.51	4.08	4.19	4.21	2.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	150/ 260	4.20	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	232/ 259	4.09	4.19	4.33	4.31	3.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	3.00	221/ 233	3.76	4.02	4.20	4.10	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.11	4.41	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 444 0101
 Title MOLECULAR MODELING
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 372
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	3	4.60	485/1674	4.60	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	697/1423	4.40	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	645/1609	4.40	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.69	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.77	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.60	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.50	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.17	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.60	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.80	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	379/1380	4.40	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	4.33	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	827/1515	4.33	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 265	4.67	4.13	4.23	4.53	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.08	4.19	4.21	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	102/ 260	4.67	4.41	4.46	4.24	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.19	4.33	4.31	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.02	4.20	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 450 0101
 Title CHEM HETERO COMPS
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 373
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	13	4.93	118/1674	4.93	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	237/1674	4.79	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	493/1423	4.57	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	629/1609	4.42	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.69	3.96	4.01	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	276/1651	4.71	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1155/1673	4.57	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	144/1656	4.82	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.17	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.30	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	121/1582	4.93	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1575	4.93	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1380	4.89	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	355/1520	4.57	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	568/1515	4.57	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1511	4.86	3.57	4.27	4.45	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490A 0101
 Title PHOTOCHEMISTRY
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 375
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.67	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.67	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	4.67	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	3.69	3.96	4.01	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	238/1535	4.67	3.77	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	5.00	3.82	4.18	4.23	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.67	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.30	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	438/1582	4.67	3.81	4.26	4.31	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	495/1575	4.67	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	4.67	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	3.53	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.57	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.46	3.94	4.19	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490B 0101
 Title PEPTIDES AND PROTEINS
 Instructor: LU, WUYUAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 376
 JAN 21, 2006
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	3.76	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	3.53	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	3.67	4.22	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.89	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.66	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.17	4.43	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.00	4.30	4.69	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	3.81	4.26	4.31	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	3.70	4.27	4.35	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.62	3.94	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.40	4.01	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1493/1515	2.00	3.53	4.24	4.40	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1495/1511	2.00	3.57	4.27	4.45	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	988/ 994	1.00	3.46	3.94	4.19	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 684A 0101
 Title PHOTOCHEM & SPECTROSCO
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 377
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	5	4.57	521/1674	4.57	3.87	4.27	4.44	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	705/1674	4.43	3.76	4.23	4.34	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1423	4.43	3.53	4.27	4.28	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	614/1609	4.43	3.67	4.22	4.34	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	530/1585	4.29	3.69	3.96	4.23	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.77	4.08	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	432/1651	4.57	3.82	4.18	4.32	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.89	4.69	4.78	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	4.25	3.66	4.07	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.17	4.43	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.30	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1043/1582	4.14	3.81	4.26	4.33	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	612/1575	4.57	3.70	4.27	4.30	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.62	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	3.40	4.01	4.19	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.53	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.57	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.46	3.94	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant