Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor:

Baltimore County CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A) Fall 2006

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 202

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	21	17		1131/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	11	19		1220/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	12	15	11		1208/1421		3.49	4.24	4.11	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	3	6	8	5		1511/1617		3.45	4.15	3.99	3.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	11	12	14	3.92	905/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	2	4	5	3		1401/1543		3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	18	20		1012/1647		3.70	4.12	4.06	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	39	4.85	825/1668		4.91	4.67		4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	6	24	8	4.00	918/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	8	33	4.62	647/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	36	4.78	843/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	11	17	17	4.13	987/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	16	23	4.36	809/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	15	23	4.32	405/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64
Discussion				_								4 0=		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	11	18	13		1016/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	7	15	20		1005/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	5	11	16	9		1331/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	4	4	8	13	13	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	6	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
	26	6	0	0	2	3	0	2 60	****/ 112	****	****	1 20	1 01	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36 36	8	0	0	1	1	0 1	3.60 4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.38 4.36	4.04 4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	8	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
5. Were effected for grading made effect	30	O	Ü	O	_	2	Ü	3.07	, 50			3.75	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	0	0	0	1	1.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	4	0	3		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
1 onote enough proceed for all one beauciful	50	_	,	J	-	J	5	2.00	, 2,			1.51		

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 202 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

ollment: 51

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	 А	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 47

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 203 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	21	17	4.06	1131/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	11	19	3.91	1220/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	12	15	11	3.54	1208/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	3	6	8	5	3.03	1511/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	11	12	14	3.92	905/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	18	20		1012/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	39	4.85	825/1668		4.91	4.67		4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	3	14	16	2	3.49	1365/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	2	7	8	14		1174/1514		4.13	4.39	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	3	5	8	14		1391/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	5	8	7	9		1269/1503		3.91	4.24	4.17	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	4	2	5	10	8		1309/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	4	4	5	8	5	3.23	1063/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	11	18	13		1016/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	7	15	20		1005/1502		3.84	4.26	4.06	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	5	11	16	9		1331/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29		3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	4	4	8	13	13	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	6	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	1	1	3	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	6	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 98	****	***	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 47

Fall 2006

Page 203 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

51

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	 А	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: LONGENBERGER, J (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 47

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 204 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	21	17	4.06	1131/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	11	19	3.91	1220/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	12	15	11	3.54	1208/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	3	6	8	5	3.03	1511/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	11	12	14	3.92	905/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	18	20		1012/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	39	4.85	825/1668	4.84		4.67	4.62	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	1	4	17	9	4.10	857/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	4	10	14		1070/1514		4.13	4.39	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	1	2	10	14		1284/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	932/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	6	10		4.15	988/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	4	2	5	4	5	6	3.36	1013/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	11	18	13		1016/1490	3.81		4.05	3.85	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	7	15	20		1005/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	5	11	16	9		1331/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	4	4	8	13	13	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	6	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	1	1	3	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	6	0	0	2	3	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	0	0	0	1	1.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: LONGENBERGER, J (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 47

51

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 204 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. D)

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 47

51

Fall 2006

Page 205 JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions		NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	21	17	4.06	1131/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	11	19	3.91	1220/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	12	15	11	3.54	1208/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	3	6	8	5	3.03	1511/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	11	12	14	3.92	905/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	18	20	4.06	1012/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	39	4.85	825/1668	4.84		4.67	4.62	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	4	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	877/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	3	4	7		1182/1514		4.13	4.39	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	1	0	2	7	4		1435/1551		4.36	4.66	4.55	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	1	1	1	3	6		1066/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	1	1	3	2	5		1243/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	4	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	****/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64
Discussion				_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	11	18	13		1016/1490	3.81		4.05	3.85	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	7	15	20		1005/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	5	11	16	9		1331/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	4	4	8	13	13	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	6	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	1	1	3	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	6	0	0	2	3	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	0	0	0	1	1.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 47

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 205 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

.. KRUG, JEANNEILE (INSUL. L

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	 А	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 71 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 206 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	25	18	13	3.58	1445/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	10	20	20	12	3.51	1466/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	9	14	21	10	3.30	1300/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	6	6	7	15	4	3.13	1496/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	7	14	18	15		1104/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	3	4	15	6	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	10	15	16	14	3.40	1440/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	53	4.85	807/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	2	2	10	22	16	3.92	1057/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	7	11	41	4.40	964/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	10	47	4.65	1055/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	6	11	17	28	4.08	1025/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	5	9	18	29	4.16	980/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	5	9	18	28	4.10	542/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	19	16	3.63	1107/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	6	19	24	3.97	1054/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	13	23	15		1209/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	4	7	13	16	16	3.59	735/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
		-	-	-	-	_	-	0	, 2,					

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 71
Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 206 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	3	A	17	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 71 Questionnaires: 63 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 207 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
׫«»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	25	18	13		1445/1669		3.81	4.23	4.02	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	10	20	20	12		1466/1666		3.72	4.19	4.11	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	9	14	21	10		1300/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	6	6	7	15	4		1496/1617		3.45	4.15	3.99	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	7	14	18	15		1104/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	3	4	15	6	2		1410/1543		3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3 2	0	5 0	10	15 1	16 7	14 53		1440/1647 807/1668	3.72 4.84	3.70 4.91	4.12 4.67	4.06 4.62	3.40 4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	1	3	32	13			1470/1605		3.76	4.67		3.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	Τ	3	34	13	1	3.20	14/0/1605	3.00	3.70	4.07	3.90	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	6	14	20	13	3.75	1324/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	4	5	23	23	4.18	1364/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	9	16	21	8	3.47	1340/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	5	18	16	10	3.53	1315/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	12	2	3	17	13	4	3.36	1018/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.53
51														
Discussion	4	0	4	6	1 1	1.0	1.0	2 62	1107/1400	2 01	2 52	4 05	2 05	2 (2
 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate 	4 5	0	4	6 7	14 6	19 19	16 24		1107/1490 1054/1502	3.81 4.12	3.53 3.84	4.05 4.26	3.85 4.06	3.63 3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	13	23	15		1209/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.00	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	4	7	13	16	16	3.59	735/1006		3.68	4.00	3.81	
1. Were special ecciniques successivi	_	5	-	,	13	10	10	3.35	755/1000	3.71	3.00	1.00	3.01	3.37
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	2	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •									,					

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 63

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 207 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	3	 А	17	Required for Majors	 5	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	14	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 71 Questionnaires: 63 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 208 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	25	18	13	3.58	1445/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	10	20	20	12	3.51	1466/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	9	14	21	10	3.30	1300/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	6	6	7	15	4	3.13	1496/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	7	14	18	15	3.71	1104/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	3	4	15	6	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	10	15	16	14	3.40	1440/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	53	4.85	807/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	7	1	2	11	10	2	3.38	1408/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.59
Lecture	2.2		6		_	1.0	_	2 = 5	1000 / 100	4	4	4 00	4 22	2 24
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	2	4	7	10	8		1373/1514			4.39	4.32	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	1	1	7	8	14		1396/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	1	5	8	11			1362/1503	3.91		4.24	4.17	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	2	1	11	7	7		1305/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	37	4	2	1	10	6	3	3.32	1037/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	19	16	3 63	1107/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	6	19	24		1054/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	13	23	15		1209/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	4	7	13	16			735/1006		3.68		3.81	
1. Were special ecciniques successivi	-	3	-	,	13	10	10	3.35	733/1000	3.71	3.00	1.00	3.01	3.35
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar	C 0	1	0	_	0	1	-1	4 50	****/ 112			4 20	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	~ ~ ~ ~	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00				4.36	4.19	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	***	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
2. Dia 100 didari amadipoana 1001 diaration directia	0.1	Ü	_	ŭ	ŭ	Ū	_	3.00	, 32		1.00	1.00	3.01	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 71
Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 208 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	3	 А	17	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment: 71

Questionnaires: 63

OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. D)

University of Maryland Page 209 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	25	18	13	3.58	1445/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	10	20	20	12	3.51	1466/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	9	14	21	10	3.30	1300/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	6	6	7	15	4	3.13	1496/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	7	14	18	15	3.71	1104/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	3	4	15	6	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	10	15	16	14	3.40	1440/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	53	4.85	807/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	6	1	2	4	17	6	3.83	1148/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	4	1	9	12	10	3.64	1360/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	4	5	16	11	3.86	1450/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	2	3	12	13	7	3.54	1318/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	2	11	15	6	3.58	1303/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	8	3	2	9	7	5		1023/1311			3.85	3.68	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	19	16	3 63	1107/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	6	19	24		1054/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	13	23	15		1209/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	4	7	13	16	16	3.59	735/1006		3.68	4.00	3.81	
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	4	0	1	1	1	2		****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	3.4U ****	4.45	4.06	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.23	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	02	U	U	U	U		U	1.00	, 29			1.51	1.22	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 71
Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 209 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	3	 А	17	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0103 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 71
Questionnaires: 59

Instructor:

59 St

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 210

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean		nk		Mean		Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	. aain n	General		0	0	_	1	17	20	0	2 56	1/50/	1660	2 74	2 01	1 22	4 02	2 56
			ls from this course the expected goals	0 1	0	5 3	11	17 11	28 21	8 12		1458/ 1475/				4.23	4.02	3.56
			1 3	0	0	4	13	19	18	5		1349/			3.72	4.19	$4.11 \\ 4.11$	3.48 3.12
	_		the expected goals	1	17	4	13	9	10	5		1526/		3.47	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.98
			the expected goals.	2	9	3	3	19	7	16		1163/		3.82	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.63
	_	-	bute to what you learned		31	5	3	8	7	3		1410/		3.02	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
		g system clearly	-	2	0	3	10	10	17	17		1347/		3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.61
		was class cance	-	5	5	0	0	1	2	46		641/		4.84				4.92
	-		l teaching effectiveness		3	4	2	17	22	8		1348/					3.96	
		Lecture																
1 Were th	ne inatri	actor's lectures		1	0	2	5	6	9	36	4 24	1088/	1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84
			sted in the subject	1	0	1	3	3	11	40		1208/			4.36	4.66	4.55	4.26
			and explained clearly	4	0	5	3	11	14	22		1205/		3.91			4.17	3.83
			what you learned	1	4	6	2	11	11	24		1209/		3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.59
			ance you rearned	0	6	7	5	13				944/					3.68	
		Discuss	ion															
1 Did ala			te to what you learned	1	0	8	8	1 2	17	1.0	2 20	1246/	1400	2 01	2 52	4 OE	2 0 5	2 20
			ouraged to participate	1	0	6	7	13	17	12 29		1154/		3.81		4.05	3.85	3.29
				1	0	13	8	6 15	10			- ,			3.84	4.26	4.06	3.84
			air and open discussion	1 2	6	9	9	15 15	13	9 10		1417/		3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07 3.81	2.95
4. were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	SIUI	2	ь	9	9	ь	8	19	3.3/	823/	1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.3/
		Laborat	-	55	2	0												
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material						1	1	0	0		****/		****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequat	e background information	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
		Seminar																
	_	-	to the announced theme	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available f	or individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did res	search pi	rojects contribu	te to what you learned	56	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute t	o what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
		Field W	ork															
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribut	e to what you learned	57	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you	ı clearly	y understand you	r evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available f	or consultation	55	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what	degree	could you discu	ss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
		Self P	aced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contribu	te to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
			the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
			all the students	58	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/		****	****		4.22	****
												,						
			Freq	uency	Dis	strik	outio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 18 0.00-0.99 9 A 11						ed f	or M	 Iajor	:s	1	 Gra	duate	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 21								-									
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 13						al				1	Und	er-g	rad 5	59	Non-	-major	59
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00		El	.ecti	ves				2	###	# - 1	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	rh	

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 46 ? 3

Course Section: CHEM 101 0103 University of Maryland

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 71

Ouestionnaires: 59 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 5 1 17 28 8 3.56 1458/1669 3.74 3.81 4.23 4.02 3.56 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 3 11 11 21 12 3.48 1475/1666 3.71 3.72 4.19 4.11 3.48 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 13 19 18 5 3.12 1349/1421 3.47 3.49 4.24 4.11 3.12 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 17 4 13 9 10 5 2.98 1526/1617 3.23 3.45 4.15 3.99 2.98 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 3 3 19 7 16 3.63 1163/1555 3.82 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.63 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 31 5 3 8 7 3 3.00 1410/1543 3.06 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 3 10 10 17 17 3.61 1347/1647 3.72 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.61 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 5 0 0 1 2 46 4.92 641/1668 4.84 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 4 4 2 21 18 3 3.29 1443/1605 3.80 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.58 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 12 0 2 5 13 13 14 3.68 1346/1514 4.12 4.13 4.39 4.32 3.84 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 2 2 9 10 24 4.11 1391/1551 4.36 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.26 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 18 0 2 4 15 13 7 3.46 1344/1503 3.91 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 22 0 5 6 5 12 9 3.38 1353/1506 3.89 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 10 9 5 6 7 7 2.94 1142/1311 3.73 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.32 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 8 8 13 17 12 3.29 1246/1490 3.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.29 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 6 7 6 10 29 3.84 1154/1502 4.12 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.84 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 13 8 15 13 9 2.95 1417/1489 3.67 3.59 4.29 4.07 2.95 4. Were special techniques successful 2 6 9 9 6 8 19 3.37 823/1006 3.74 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.37 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 55 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 **** 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 58 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 58 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 56 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 1 0 0 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 55 3 0 0 0 1 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 0 1 0 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 1 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 **** Frequency Distribution

Page 211

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected (Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	9	A 11	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 21	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 13	3	General	1	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 1	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 46 ? 3

Course Section: CHEM 101 0103 University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Baltimore County

Page 212

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C) Fall 2006 Enrollment: 71

Ouestionnaires: 59 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 5 1 17 28 8 3.56 1458/1669 3.74 3.81 4.23 4.02 3.56 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 3 11 11 21 12 3.48 1475/1666 3.71 3.72 4.19 4.11 3.48 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 13 19 18 5 3.12 1349/1421 3.47 3.49 4.24 4.11 3.12 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 17 4 13 9 10 5 2.98 1526/1617 3.23 3.45 4.15 3.99 2.98 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 3 3 19 7 16 3.63 1163/1555 3.82 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.63 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 31 5 3 8 7 3 3.00 1410/1543 3.06 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 3 10 10 17 17 3.61 1347/1647 3.72 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.61 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 5 0 0 1 2 46 4.92 641/1668 4.84 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 24 7 4 3 8 11 2 3.14 1485/1605 3.80 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.58 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 35 0 2 3 7 6 6 3.46 1398/1514 4.12 4.13 4.39 4.32 3.84 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 37 0 1 0 4 6 11 4.18 1364/1551 4.36 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.26 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 39 0 1 1 8 5 5 3.60 1301/1503 3.91 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 37 0 3 4 6 5 4 3.14 1393/1506 3.89 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 35 11 3 3 2 2 3 2.92 ****/1311 3.73 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.32 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 8 8 13 17 12 3.29 1246/1490 3.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.29 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 6 7 6 10 29 3.84 1154/1502 4.12 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.84 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 13 8 15 13 9 2.95 1417/1489 3.67 3.59 4.29 4.07 2.95 4. Were special techniques successful 2 6 8 19 3.37 823/1006 3.74 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.37 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 55 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 58 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 58 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 56 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 1 0 Λ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 55 3 0 0 0 1 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 0 1 0 Self Paced

Frequency Distribution

58 0 0

1

0

0 1.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 ****

1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 ****

0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ****

58 0

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	9	A 11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 21						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 13	General	1	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 1	Electives	2	#### - Means	ther	e are not enough	h

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 46 ? 3

Course Section: CHEM 101 0103 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 71
Ouestionnaires: 59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 213

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 5 1 17 28 8 3.56 1458/1669 3.74 3.81 4.23 4.02 3.56 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 3 11 11 21 12 3.48 1475/1666 3.71 3.72 4.19 4.11 3.48 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 13 19 18 5 3.12 1349/1421 3.47 3.49 4.24 4.11 3.12 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 17 4 13 9 10 5 2.98 1526/1617 3.23 3.45 4.15 3.99 2.98 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 3 3 19 7 16 3.63 1163/1555 3.82 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.63 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 31 5 3 8 7 3 3.00 1410/1543 3.06 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 3 10 10 17 17 3.61 1347/1647 3.72 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.61 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 5 0 0 1 2 46 4.92 641/1668 4.84 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 25 6 1 0 1 12 14 4.36 565/1605 3.80 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.58 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 26 0 3 2 4 8 16 3.97 1227/1514 4.12 4.13 4.39 4.32 3.84 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 30 0 0 2 3 9 15 4.28 1330/1551 4.36 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.26 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 33 0 0 1 0 12 13 4.42 686/1503 3.91 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 34 0 1 2 4 7 11 4.00 1069/1506 3.89 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 30 6 2 2 7 6 6 3.52 929/1311 3.73 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.32 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 8 8 13 17 12 3.29 1246/1490 3.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.29 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 6 7 6 10 29 3.84 1154/1502 4.12 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.84 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 13 8 15 13 9 2.95 1417/1489 3.67 3.59 4.29 4.07 2.95 4. Were special techniques successful 2 6 8 19 3.37 823/1006 3.74 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.37 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 55 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 58 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 58 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 56 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 1 0 0 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 57 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 55 3 0 0 0 1 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 0 1 0 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 1 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 0 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ****

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	ades Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	9	A 11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 21						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 13	General	1	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	e are not enougl	n

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 46 ? 3

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 214 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 58

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	32	11		1253/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	19	21	15		1303/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	10	17	18	10		1267/1421		3.49	4.24	4.11	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	5	14	15	5		1428/1617		3.45	4.15	3.99	3.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0 4	5	10	19	20	4.00	773/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28 0	2	4 6	10	8	3		1399/1543		3.48	4.06	3.86	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	10	17 10	22 45		1169/1647 882/1668		3.70 4.91	4.12 4.67	4.06 4.62	3.89 4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	14	23	10		1148/1605			4.07		3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	U	۷	14	23	10	3.04	1146/1605	3.00	3.76	4.07	3.90	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	16	38	4.61	663/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	11	41	4.66	1028/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	9	26	18	4.00	1066/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	13	17	22	3.98	1090/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	4	8	19	26	4.18	495/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.75
Pilemandan														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	11	24	20	4.07	820/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1 2	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.07	880/1502	4.12	3.84	4.05	4.06	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	13	21	19		1072/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.00	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	15	23			617/1006			4.00	3.81	
i. Were special teeimiques successial	2	2	2	U	13	23		3.07	017/1000	3.71	3.00	1.00	3.01	3.07
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***
		-	-	_	-	_	-		,,					

Course Section: CHEM 101 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A) University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 214 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 58

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	 А	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	0						

M 101 0104 Unive

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSC Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 58

OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

tr. B) Fall

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 215 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse	Eval	uatic	on (Duest	ionnai	re
-----------	-------	------	-------	------	-------	--------	----

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	32	11	3.93	1253/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	19	21	15	3.81	1303/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	10	17	18	10	3.42	1267/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	5	14	15	5	3.39	1428/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	5	10	19	20	4.00	773/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	4	10	8	3	3.07	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	10	17	22	3.89	1169/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10			882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	4	0	0	14	23	3	3.72	1233/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	4	20	16		1136/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	3	15	23		1270/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	12	18	10		1197/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	5	6	14			1132/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	8	2	5	7	12	8	3.56	914/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	11	24	20	4.07	820/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.25	880/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	13	21	19		1072/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	15	23	14	3.87	617/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 70
Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 215 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

ent: 70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	 А	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	16	General	1	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 58

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 216 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	32	11	3.93	1253/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	19	21	15	3.81	1303/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	10	17	18	10	3.42	1267/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	5	14	15	5	3.39	1428/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	5	10	19	20	4.00	773/1555		3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	4	10	8	3	3.07	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	10	17	22		1169/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	45		882/1668		4.91	4.67		4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	0	0	10	25	4	3.85	1140/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	0	9	12	16	4.03	1193/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	1	4	9	24		1279/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	0	12	12	12		1157/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	3	6	12	14		1047/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	12	1	3	5	10	7	3.73	801/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	11	24	20	4.07	820/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.25	880/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	13	21	19		1072/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	15	23	14	3.87	617/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 216 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	 А	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	16	General	1	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 217 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

- ·			
Student.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	32	11	3.93	1253/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	19	21	15	3.81	1303/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	10	17	18	10	3.42	1267/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	5	14	15	5	3.39	1428/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	5	10	19	20	4.00	773/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	4	10	8	3	3.07	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	10	17	22	3.89	1169/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	45	4.82	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	11	0	0	13	15	1	3.59	1321/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75
Lecture	00	0	1	1	-	1 2	1 1	1 00	1105/1514	4 10	4 12	4 20	4 20	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1 2	1	7 5	13 9	14		1185/1514			4.39	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21			1			20		1364/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	1	12 7	9	12		1225/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	1	2		13	12		1132/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	11	1	6	4	8	7	3.54	924/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	11	24	20	4.07	820/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.25	880/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	13	21	19		1072/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	15	23			617/1006	3.74		4.00	3.81	
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Cominan														
Seminar	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	***
	55	2	0		1	0	0		,	****	****			***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.22	3.79 3.94	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55 56	1	0	1 1	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	****	4.20 3.95	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	1	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	***/ 98			3.95	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.50		****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.30		****	****	4.25	4.25	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	***	****	4.34	4.22	***

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 70
Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 217 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	 А	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	16	General	1	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 58 Questionn

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 218 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

nnaires:	46	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	13	14		1367/1669		3.81		4.02	3.76
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	14	15		1265/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.87
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	15	14	9		1280/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.39
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	5	12	11	3		1475/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.24
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	12	8				3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.86
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	5	7	6	7		1260/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	11	6			1337/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.63
	How many times was class cancelled	1 9	0	0	0	0	6			788/1668		4.91			4.87
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	1	1	11	15	9	3.81	1164/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.07
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	10	30	4.43	908/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	5	38	4.72	954/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.49
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	8	5	17	15	3.80	1210/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.97
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	3	2	10	23		1069/1506		3.80		4.17	4.09
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	1	7	10			531/1311				3.68	4.06
	Discussion		_			_									
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	13	24	4.24	701/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.24
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1		12	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	2	14	21		1098/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.93
4.	Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	1	12	27	4.29	368/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.29
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0			****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
										,					
_	Seminar	4.0				_									
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	,	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	***	****	3.95	3.90	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
٠.	The state of the s		-	-	J	J	Ū	_		, 50					
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 218 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Institution: CARPENIER, IARA (INSTI.

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 219 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
1	General	_	0	1	4	1 4	1.0	1 1	2 76	1267/1660	2 74	2 01	4 00	4 00	2 76
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	13	14		1367/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.76
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	-	-	-	_	13	14	15		1265/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.87
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	15	14	9		1280/1421		3.49	4.24	4.11	3.39
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	5	12	11	3		1475/1617		3.45	4.15	3.99	3.24
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	12	8	18		,	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.86
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	5	7	6	7		1260/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	11	6	19		1337/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.63
	How many times was class cancelled	1 11	0	0	0	0	6	39		788/1668		4.91	4.67	4.62	4.87
9.	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			2	1	10	17	5	3.63	1299/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.07
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	2	9	5	14	3.94	1248/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	1	2	7	24	4.49	1208/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.49
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	2	2	7	10	13		1176/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.97
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	3	3	0	10	16		1055/1506		3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	2	1	7	8	11	3.86	725/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.06
	Discussion	1	0	_	_	_									
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned			2	1	5	13	24	4.24	. ,	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.24
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	12	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	2	14	21		1098/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.93
4.	Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	1	12	27	4.29	368/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.29
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
1	Seminar	42	2	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	++++/ 110	****	++++	4 20	4 04	****
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43		-	-	1	-	0		,	****		4.38	4.04	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	-	1	0	4.00	, , ,		****	4.36	4.19	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	* * * * *	^ ^ ^ ^	3.95	3.90	
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
	0.15 - 1														
-	Self Paced	4 -	^		_	^	^	-	F 00	****	الدائد الدائد	2 40	4 34	4 1 5	4.4.4.4
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	***	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 219 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	10	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 46

KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 220 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			-			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	13	14	3.76	1367/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	14	15	3.87	1265/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	15	14	9	3.39	1280/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	5	12	11	3	3.24	1475/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	12	8	18	3.86	971/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	5	7	6	7	3.50	1260/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	11	6	19		1337/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	788/1668		4.91	4.67	4.62	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	436/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	845/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	1216/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	1045/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	770/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	5	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	587/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	13	24	4.24	701/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	12	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	2	14	21	3.93	1098/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	1	12	27	4.29	368/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	***	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	***	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	***	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 46 Baltimore County

Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 220 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 46

Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 221 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequencies		Instructor		tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	13	14	3.76	1367/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.76
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	14	15	3.87	1265/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.87
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	15	14	9	3.39	1280/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.39
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	5	12	11	3	3.24	1475/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.24
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	12	8	18	3.86	971/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.86
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	5	7	6	7	3.50	1260/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	11	6	19	3.63	1337/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.63
8.	How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	6	39	4.87	788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.87
9.	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	2	7	9	4.39	525/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.07
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	1042/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			0	1	3	5	10		1334/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.49
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	1	3	7	8	4.16	969/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.97
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27 27	0	0	3	3	5	8	3.95	1132/1506	3.89	3.80		4.17	4.09
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	5	0	1	2	4	8		439/1311				3.68	4.06
			_	-	_	_	_	_		,					
	Discussion		_			_									
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	13	24	4.24	701/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.24
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1		12	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	2	14			1098/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.93
4.	Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	1	12	27	4.29	368/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.29
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	***
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	1	0			****	****	4.36	4.19	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	3	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
	J		_	-		_		_		,					
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	0	0		,	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	, -	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	***
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.30	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	***
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	***
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	***
4.	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	***
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 46 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 221 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

58

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	 11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	4	 Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 222 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	9	12	16	3.81	1345/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.81
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	18	13	3.93	1192/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.93
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	8	13	13	3.62	1185/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.62
4	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	8	9	5	3.28	1467/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.28
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	10	12	17	4.13	687/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.13
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	3	4	7	5	5	3.21	1358/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained		0	1	3	6	12	20	4.12	984/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.12
8.	How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	769/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88
9	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	11	16	6	3.74	1218/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.97
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	11	29	4.64	616/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.61
		1	0	0	0	1	8	33	4.76	862/1551	4.12	4.13	4.66	4.55	4.70
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	1	2	8	15	16		1055/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.70
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	1	1		7	15								
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1			21	4.23	926/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.26
5	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	2	7	6	22	4.13	525/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.03
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	14	22	4.16	764/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.16
2	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49
3 .	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	973/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.16
4	Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	10	21	4.22	393/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.22
	Laboratory														
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3 .	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
	Seminar														
1	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
		41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.94	****
Э.	were criteria for grading made clear	41	Τ.	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	***/ 98			3.95	3.90	
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	***	4.39	4.30	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
3.	224 Control once for carry out freta activities		0	J	J	J	_	_	1.50	, 50			1.55	1.50	
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3.	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5	Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 222 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	 6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

University of Maryland
ESTRY I Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSON Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 43

OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

r. B) Fall 2006

Page 223 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Studen	t Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequen		ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	3	3	9	12	16	3.81	1345/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	18	13	3.93	1192/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	8	13	13	3.62	1185/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	8	9	5	3.28	1467/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	10	12	17	4.13	687/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	3	4	7		5		1358/1543		3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	12	20	4.12			3.70	4.12	4.06	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	769/1668			4.67		4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	1	7	20			1172/1605			4.07		3.97
J. now would you grade the overall eddening effectiveness		-	Ü	_	,	20	3	3.01	11/2/1005	3.00	3.70	1.07	3.70	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	616/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	7	26		1000/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	4	9	18	4.38	753/1503		3.91	4.24	4.17	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	13	15	4.28	884/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	3	2	3	6	17	4.03					3.68	4.03
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	,	3	5	2	J	O	Τ,	1.03	3/2/1311	3.73	3.37	3.03	3.00	1.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	14	22	4.16	764/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	973/1489	3.67		4.29	4.07	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	10			393/1006					
4. Were special techniques successful	U	3		_	,	10	21	7.22	393/1000	3.71	3.00	1.00	3.01	7.22
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1			****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specifica	11	_	U	U	O	O	_	3.00	/ 200		3.07	1.13	1.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
J. Were Criteria for grading made crear	11	1	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 50			3.75	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	2	1	0	0	3		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2		,	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
·	41	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	U	U	U	U	Т		4.50	***/ 30			4.33	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	1	1	2	2 17	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0			0	2		,	****	3.4U ****			****
-	40	1		0	0				,	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	****/ 29			4.34	4.22	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Baltimore County r. B) Fall 2006

Page 223 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	6 Required for Major		1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	14	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1 #### - Means there a		are not enough	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 43 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 224 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	9	12	16	3.81	1345/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	18	13	3.93	1192/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	8	13	13	3.62	1185/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	8	9	5	3.28	1467/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	10	12	17	4.13	687/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	3	4	7	5	5	3.21	1358/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	12	20	4.12	984/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	769/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	737/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	522/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	788/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18 19	0	0	1	1		16	4.54	519/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	7		4.43	731/1506		3.80	4.26	4.17	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	3	0	2	3		4.17						4.03
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	Ι,	J	J	U	2	3	13	4.1/	400/1011	3.73	3.37	3.03	3.00	1.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2		22	4.16	764/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	973/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	10	21	4.22	393/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.22
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3 00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	11	_	O	Ü	O	O	_	3.00	, 200		3.07	1.15	1.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.40	4.31	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.23	***
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	11	U	J	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 49			1.57	1.44	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 50

Baltimore County KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Fall 2006

Page 224 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: LONGENBERGER, JE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 225 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eane:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
******														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	9	12	16	3.81	1345/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	18	13	3.93	1192/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	8	13	13	3.62	1185/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	8	9	5	3.28	1467/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	10	12	17	4.13	687/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	3	4	7	5	5	3.21	1358/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	12	20	4.12	984/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	769/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	0	3	14	6	4.13	820/1605	3.80		4.07	3.96	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	892/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	1143/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	879/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	4	9	9	4.09	1033/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	5	4	1	0	5	10	3.80	764/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	14	22	4.16	764/1490	3.81		4.05	3.85	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	973/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	10	21	4.22	393/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.22
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar	4.0	-	•	•	0	0	0	<b>-</b> 00	/ 110	ale ale ale ale	also also also also	4 20	4 0 4	als als als als
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97		****	4.36	4.19	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	3	0	0	0	1	3.29	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.22	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****				****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	3.00	3.97 4.33	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	U	U	U	U	Т		4.50	***/ 30			4.33	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
	_	-	-	-	-	-	_		,				. = =	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: LONGENBERGER, JE (Instr. D)

Questionnaires: 43

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 225 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 226

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	es 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	27	16	3.83	1332/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	19	25	9		1455/1666		3.72	4.19	4.11	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	10	11	19	13	3.47	1239/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	4	4	14	18	5	3.36	1442/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	6	9	17	18	3.77	1045/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	7	7	6	3.06	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	8	4	10	13	22		1331/1647		3.70	4.12	4.06	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	46		901/1668		4.91	4.67	4.62	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	3	10	25	12	3.86	1124/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	9	46	4.63	631/1514		4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	8	48	4.70	986/1551		4.36	4.66	4.55	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	5	8	14	32	4.24			3.91	4.24	4.17	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	8	12	34	4.20	958/1506		3.80	4.26	4.17	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	4	3	18	28	4.09	547/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	13	23	18	3.93	934/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	8	15	29	4.16	944/1502		3.84	4.26	4.06	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	8	23	18		1168/1489		3.59	4.29	4.07	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	7	7	13	20	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	2	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	3	1	0	0	2.25		****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 92		****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	,	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75			3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 46		****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 60

68

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 226 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	. — — — — — А	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	31						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	1						

1 0202 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSON, Enrollment: 68

OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Fall 2006

Page 227 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	60	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Frequencies		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Ouestions	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	3	3	11	27	16		1332/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	19	25	9		1455/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	10	11	19	13	3.47	1239/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	4	4	14	18	5		1442/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	6	9	17	18		1045/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	7	7	6		1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	8	4	10	13	22		1331/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	46	4.81		4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	6	0	1	14	20	5	3.72	1233/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	2	1	6	15	22	4.17	1130/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	2	1	6	14	24		1354/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	2	10	11	21		1025/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	6	5	11	20		1038/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	5	1	4	11	17	3.89	705/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.95
1														
Discussion			_											
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	13	23	18	3.93	934/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	8	15	29	4.16	944/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	8	23	18		1168/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	-7	7	13	20	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	1	1	1	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	0	1	2	0		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 68

OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 227 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	31						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)

Questionnaires: 60

Enrollment: 68

Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 228

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect														
			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	27	16	3.83	1332/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	19	25	9		1455/1666		3.72	4.19	4.11	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	10	11	19	13	3.47	1239/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	4	4	14	18	5		1442/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	6	9	17	18	3.77	1045/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	7	7	6	3.06	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	8	4	10	13	22	3.65	1331/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	46	4.81	901/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	10	0	0	4	17	13	4.26	678/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	2	0	6	12	20	4.20	1118/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	2	0	7	8	25		1326/1551		4.36	4.66	4.55	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	0	5	16	17	4.15	969/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	3	4	12	18	4.22	942/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	8	3	0	4	8	14	4.03	572/1311		3.57	3.85	3.68	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	13	23	18	3.93	934/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	8	15	29	4.16	944/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	8	23	18	3.81	1168/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	7	7	13	20	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	1	1	2	1	1		****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	2	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	0	3	0	1		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25		****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	1	1	1	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40		****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	2	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	1	0	1	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75		****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00		****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 68

Fall 2006

Page 228 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	31						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: LONGENBERGER, JE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 60

68

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 229 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean	
General	0	0	2	2	11	0.7	1.0	2 02	1220/1660	2 74	2 01	4 00	4 00	2 02
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	27	16		1332/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	19	25	9		1455/1666		3.72	4.19	4.11	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	10	11	19	13		1239/1421		3.49	4.24	4.11	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	4	4	14	18	5		1442/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	6	9	17	18		1045/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	7	7	6		1399/1543		3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	8	4	10	13	22		1331/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2 22	1	0	0	0	11	46	4.81	901/1668		4.91	4.67	4.62	4.81
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		6	0	0	6	14	12	4.19	769/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	2	1	4	10	17	4.15	1148/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	3	0	5	8	21		1364/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	0	5	11	14	4.19	932/1503		3.91	4.24	4.17	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	2	4	9	16	4.26	909/1506		3.80	4.26	4.17	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	5	3	1	3	8	9	3.79	769/1311		3.57	3.85	3.68	3.95
			_	_	_	_	_							
Discussion	_	_	_	_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	13	23	18	3.93			3.53	4.05	3.85	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	8	15	29	4.16			3.84	4.26	4.06	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	8	23	18		1168/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	7	7	13	20	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25		****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	2	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	0	3	0	1		****/ 206	***	3.87	4.15	4.01	***
Seminar		-	0	_	-	0	_	0 05	/ 110	de de de de	als als als als	4 20	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	3	1	0	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	2	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	,	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	2	0	2	1	0			****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	2	0	1		, -	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00		****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	1	2	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
		_	_	_	-	_	-		,					
Self Paced	_													
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	,	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: LONGENBERGER, JE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 68
Questionnaires: 60

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 229 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 68

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	31						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 52

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 230 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_											
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	16	27	8		1359/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	14	21	10		1409/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	9	10	21	10		1195/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	3	12 9	11	7		1403/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1 2	-	19	15	3.96	856/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	7 1	7	5	5	4		1470/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4 0	18 5	20 43	4.90	1066/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06 4.62	3.98 4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	0	15	18			731/1668 1233/1605	4.84 3.80	4.91 3.76	4.67 4.07	3.96	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	1	2	U	15	10	9	3.73	1233/1605	3.00	3.70	4.07	3.90	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	11	36	4.56	739/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	4	45	4.77	862/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	8	13	25	4.12	1005/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	8	11	28	4.24	926/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	3	12	12	19	3.96	643/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.61
Discussion		•	_	_	_				500/5400					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	./	18	25	4.25	692/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	6	15	28	4.31	836/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	8	16	20		1090/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	13	8	25	4.00	479/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	4	1	0	0	0	3	4 00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	3	1	0	0	0	3		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	1	0	1	0	3		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	2	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.00	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	2	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
3. Dia conferences help you early out fred accivities	1/	4	J		U	_	_	5.07	, 30			1.33	1.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 52

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 230 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	2						

HEM 101 0203

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSC Enrollment: 67

OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

B) Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 231 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	52	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	16	27	8		1359/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	14	21	10		1409/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	9	10	21	10		1195/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	3	12	11	7		1403/1617		3.45		3.99	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	9	19	15	3.96	856/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	7	2	5	5	4		1470/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	7	4	18	20		1066/1647	3.72	3.70		4.06	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	731/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	7	1	2	8	20	6	3.76	1210/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.03
Lecture	1.0	0	1	2	4	1.0	1 -	1 00	1100/1514	4 10	4 12	4 20	4 20	4 24
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	1 1	3	4	10	15		1182/1514		4.13	4.39	4.32	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	1	4 5	10	24		1284/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16		1	3		11 5	16		1040/1503	3.91	3.91		4.17	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	2	1	5 3	5		15 7		1174/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	12	Τ	3	6	2	/	3.58	904/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	18	25	4.25	692/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	6	15	28	4.31	836/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	8	16	20		1090/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	13	8	25	4.00	479/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00		4.00
1. Were special ecciniques successivi	O	_	2	J	13	O	23	1.00	175/1000	3.71	3.00	1.00	3.01	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	1	2		,	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	3	1	0	0	0	3			****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	1	0	1	0	3		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	2	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 206	****	3.87		4.01	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	1	1	1		****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25		****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 67

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 231 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	2						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor:

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 52

OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 232 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	16	27	8	3.79	1359/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	14	21	10	3.63	1409/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	9	10	21	10	3.59	1195/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	3	12	11	7	3.44	1403/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	9	19	15	3.96	856/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	7	2	5	5	4	2.87	1470/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	7	4	18	20	3.98	1066/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	731/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	8	1	2	3	9	11	4.04	897/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.03
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	29	0	2	0	1	4	16	4.39	964/1514			4.39	4.32	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	1	0	2	5	21		1152/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	1	3	4	15	4.29	843/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	1	1	2	4	3	11	4.00	1069/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	7	2	1	5	1	6	3.53	924/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	18	25	4.25	692/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	6	15	28	4.25	836/1502	4.12	3.84	4.05	4.06	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	8	16	20		1090/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.00	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	13	8	25	4.00				4.29		4.00
4. Were special techniques successiul	U	1	۷	3	13	0	25	4.00	4/9/1006	3.74	3.00	4.00	3.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	0	2	1	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	, -	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	1	2	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	2	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25		****	****	4.00	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	1	2	0	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		2	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	3.UU ****	4.33	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	2	U	Т	U	1	Τ	3.67	***/ 30		* * * *	4.33	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25		****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25		****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 29	****	****	4.34		* * * *

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 232 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

67 Questionnaires: 52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0203 Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: LONGENBERGER, JE (Instr. D) Enrollment: 67

Questionnaires: 52

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 233

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
a1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	16	27	8	2 70	1359/1669	2 7/	3.81	1 22	4.02	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	14	21	10		1409/1666	3.74	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	9	10	21	10		1195/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	3	12	11	7		1403/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	9	19	15	3.96	856/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	7	2	5	5	4		1470/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	7	4	18	20		1066/1647	3.72		4.12	4.06	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	731/1668		4.91	4.67	4.62	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	7	0	0	0	11	17	4.61	298/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	2	0	2	6	18		1003/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	0	3	6	23		1184/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	2	7	17	4.36	777/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	1	4	6	15	4.22	934/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	13	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	1004/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	18	25	4.25	692/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	6	15	28	4.31	836/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	8	16	20		1090/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	13	8	25	4.00	479/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 67

Title

LONGENBERGER, JE (Instr. D)

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 233 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 52 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	2						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 59

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 234 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	8	20	17	11	3.42	1516/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	13	17	18	3.64	1402/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	15	18	3.57	1202/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	3	11	14	7	5	3.00	1516/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	6	19	11	13		1280/1555		3.79	4.00	3.92	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	6	13	5	2		1476/1543		3.48	4.06	3.86	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	8	9	14	20		1393/1647		3.70	4.12	4.06	3.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	44		926/1668		4.91	4.67	4.62	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	2	1	14	21	10	3.75	1210/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	3	12	39	4 51	799/1514	4 12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	10	42		1069/1551	4.36	4.13	4.66	4.55	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	3	11	17	21		1168/1503		3.91	4.24	4.17	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	3	13	7	29		1038/1506		3.80	4.24	4.17	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	12	13	27		513/1311		3.57	3.85	3.68	3.50
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4		۷	12	13	۷ /	4.13	313/1311	3.13	3.37	3.03	3.00	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	18	14	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	6	15	11	23	3.78	1196/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	6	14	15	17	3.53	1266/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	5	8	16	8	16	3.42	804/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	1	4	3	1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	1	1	3	3	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Cominan														
Seminar	40	3	0	1	2	1	2	2 [7	++++/ 110	****	****	4 20	1 01	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	2	3 2	1	2	3.57	****/ 112 ****/ 97	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49					1	2	3.43	,	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	3	3	0	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50 50	2	1 2	2	2	1 1	1	2.86	****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	****	4.20 3.95	3.94 3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	2	1	2	Т	1	2./1	****/ 98	***		3.95	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	1	2	3	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	0	1	2	3	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
1. 11. John of the first additional addition	J 1	_	3	_		3	_	3.37	, 50			1.55	2.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 66
Questionnaires: 59

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 234 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 66

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	А	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	4						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 59

Page 235 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

		Frequenc		ncie	s		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	8	20	17	11		1516/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	13	17	18		1402/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	15	18		1202/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	3	11	14	7	5	3.00	1516/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	6	19	11	13		1280/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	6	13	5	2		1476/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	8	9	14	20		1393/1647	3.72	3.70		4.06	3.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	44	4.78	926/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	6	1	2	24	17	1	3.33	1428/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.49
Lecture			_	_	_									
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	3	9	7		12		1385/1514		4.13	4.39	4.32	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	4	9	12	23		1396/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	7	2	13	13	12		1351/1503	3.91	3.91		4.17	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	2	7	3	11	11	9		1369/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	16	3	7	6	8	7	3.29	1045/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	18	14	12	3 20	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	6	15	11	23		1196/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	6	14	15	17		1266/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	5	8	16	8	16	3.42		3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	
1. Note special deciminates successful	-	3	3	Ü	10	O		3.12	001/1000	3.71	3.00	1.00	3.01	3.12
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	1	3	1	2		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	3	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	2	4	2	1		,	****	4.00	4.22	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	1	2	3	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	0	1	2	3	1		****/ 30	***	****	4.33		****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freit activities	31	_	U	_	2	J	_	3.37	/ 30			1.33	1.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***

Course Section: CHEM 101 0204 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

# Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	А	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	3	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	15							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	38					
				?	4							

Page 235

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 59

GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C) 66

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 236 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	8	20	17	11	3.42	1516/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	13	17	18	3.64	1402/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	15	18	3.57	1202/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	3	11	14	7	5		1516/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	6	19	11	13		1280/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	6	13	5	2		1476/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	8	9	14	20		1393/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	44		926/1668			4.67		4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	10	5	5	9	6	3	2.89	1527/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	5	6	6	12	6		1435/1514		4.13	4.39	4.32	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	2	5	6	10	12		1471/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	9	4	9	9	3		1448/1503		3.91	4.24	4.17	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	2	9	3	7	9	3		1431/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	15	2	6	2	7	2	3.05	1109/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	18		12		1246/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	6	15	11	23		1196/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	6	14	15	17		1266/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	5	8	16	8	16	3.42	804/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	1	4	3	1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	1	1	3	3	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	1	3	1	2		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	3	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	3	3	0	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	1 2	2	2	1	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.10	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	2	4	2	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	3	1	1	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	1	2	3	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 66

CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County , SOUMYA (Instr. C) Fall 2006

Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 236 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 59 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	Majors	
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	А	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate 1		Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	4						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 237 JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean	
1															
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	8	20	17	11	3 42	1516/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	13	17	18		1402/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	15	18		1202/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	3	11	14	7	5		1516/1617		3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	6	19	11	13	3.43	1280/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	6	13	5	2	2.83	1476/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	8	9	14	20		1393/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10		4.78	926/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	11	0	1	6	9	8	4.00	918/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	3	5	2	8	12		1341/1514		4.13	4.39	4.32	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	1	2	6	6	13		1404/1551		4.36	4.66	4.55	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	5	1	4	6	13		1250/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33 33	1 8	3 2	2	3 1	7 8	10 4		1239/1506 939/1311		3.80	4.26 3.85	4.17 3.68	3.48 3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	8	۷	3	1	8	4	3.50	939/1311	3./3	3.5/	3.85	3.08	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	18	14	12		1246/1490	3.81		4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	6	15	11	23		1196/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0 5	6 5	6	14	15	17		1266/1489		3.59	4.29	4.07		
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	5	8	16	8	16	3.42	804/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	3	4	1	2		****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	1	4	3	1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	1	1	3	3	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	1	3	1	2		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	3	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50 50	2	1 2	2 1	2	1	1		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	۷	۷	1	2	1	Τ	2./1	****/ 98		****	3.95	3.90		
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	1	1	3	3		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	2	4	2	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	3	1	1	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	1	2	3	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	***	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	2	2	3	1		****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	5	2	0			****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51 51	1 0	0	2 1	3	1	1 2		****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	эΤ	U	U	Т	4	1	۷	3.50	/ 29			4.34	4.22		

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 59

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 237 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

66

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	Majors	
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	А	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate 1		Major	3	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	15							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	38					
				?	4							

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 62 Questionnaires: 53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 238 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	ane	ncie	S		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	14	19	11		1427/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	21	11		1329/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	22	10		1159/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	12	13	6		1398/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	2	11	19	10		1012/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	22	4	7	4	8	3		1430/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	18	14	8		1459/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	8			952/1668	4.84		4.67	4.62	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	13	24	5	3.81	1172/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	14	30	4.46	861/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	3	11	34		1119/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	11	21	14		1096/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	5	6	15	21		1051/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	4	5	15			587/1311				3.68	3.74
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	12	14	12	3.48	1172/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	10	10	21	3.94	1085/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	5	12	17	8	3.38	1324/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	6	3	15	9	10	3.33	846/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.33
_ ,														
Laboratory		_			_									****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	1	0	5	3	0		****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	,	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	2	3	2		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44 44	2	0	1	2	2 4	2		****/ 223 ****/ 206	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	3	U	U	2	4	U	3.67	~~~/ 206		3.87	4.15	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	,	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	,	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	, -	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
J J														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	3	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	4 -	0	1	0	2	4	0	2 05	****/		2 40	4 24	4 1 1	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.23	,	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	,	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45 45	1 0	0	0	5 3	2	0	3.29	,	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45 45	0	1 1	1	2	3 2	1 2	3.38	****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	****	4.25 4.34	4.25 4.22	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	U	Τ	Т	4	4	4	3.38	/ 29			4.34	4.22	

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 62 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 238 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 53 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment: 62 Questionnaires: 53

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 239 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	14	19	11	2 62	1427/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	21	11		1329/1666	3.74	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	22	10		1159/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	12	13	6		1398/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	2	11	19	10		1012/1555		3.79	4.00	3.92	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	22	4	7	4	8	3		1430/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	18	14	8		1459/1647		3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	8	38		952/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	1	23	13	4		1391/1605		3.76	4.07		3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	6	13	10	13	3.71	1337/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	9	15	19	4.13	1381/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	4	16	15	6	3.50	1330/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	4	15	14	6	3.38	1351/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	8	3	6	6	5	11	3.48	950/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	12	14	12	3.48	1172/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	10	10	21	3.94	1085/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	5	12	17	8		1324/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	6	3	15	9	10	3.33	846/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	1	0	5	3	0		****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	2	3	2		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	2	0	1	2	2	2		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	3	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar		_			_							4 00		
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	6	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45 45	4 3	0	0	2	2 4	0 1	3.50 4.20	****/ 92 ****/ 105	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45 45	2	0	0	2	3	1		****/ 98	****	****	4.20 3.95	3.94 3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	43	2	U	U	۷	3		3.03	/ 90			3.93	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	1	4	1		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	1	0	2	3	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	1	1	2	2	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	3	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced		_											_	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	****/ 29	****	* * * *	4.34	4.22	^ ^ * *

Course Section: CHEM 101 0205 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 53

62

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 239 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment: 62

GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)

Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 240 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	14	19	11	3.63	1427/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	21	11		1329/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	22	10		1159/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	12	13	6		1398/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	2	11	19	10		1012/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	22	4	7	4	8	3		1430/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	18	14	8		1459/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	8	38			4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	4	5	6	7	4	4	2.85	1534/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	5	4	7	5	5	3 04	1454/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	4	0	7	7	13		1462/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	5	5	5	9	3		1423/1503	3.91	3.91		4.17	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	7	4	7	6	4		1426/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	12	1	3	3	3	3		****/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.74
or bid dudiovibual occumiques cimanoc four undersounding			_	J	J		3	3.31	, 1011	3.75	3.37	3.03	3.00	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	12	14	12		1172/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	10	10	21		1085/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	5	12	17	8		1324/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	6	3	15	9	10	3.33	846/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	1	0	5	3	0	3 11	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	2	0	1	2	2	2		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	3	0	0	2	4	0		****/ 206	***	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar		_	0	0	-	0	0	2 68	***** / 110	de de de de	ale ale ale ale	4 20	4 0 4	de de de de
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	6	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	1	1	2	2	1			****	3.00	3.97		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	3	1	1	1	2	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced			_											
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	****/ 29	****	^ ^ * *	4.34	4.22	^ ^ ~ ~

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)

Questionnaires: 53

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 240 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	С	14	General	1	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County

Title Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 62 Questionnaires: 53

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 241 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	ane	ncie	S		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	14	19	11		1427/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	21	11		1329/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	22	10		1159/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	12	13	6		1398/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	2	11	19	10		1012/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	22	4	7	4	8	3		1430/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	18	14	8		1459/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	8	38	4.77		4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	6	0	1	4	11	10	4.15	800/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	1	1	5	8	11	4.04	1190/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	2	10	14		1223/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	5	10	- 8	4.13		3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	9	7	7	3.72	1254/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	5	1	3	4	2	8		807/1311				3.68	3.74
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	12	14	12	3.48	1172/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	10	10	21	3.94	1085/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	5	12	17	8		1324/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	6	3	15	9	10	3.33	846/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.33
- 1														
Laboratory	4.0	0		•	_	2	0	2 11		als als als als	4 00	4 00	2 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	1	0	5	3	0		****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0 1	1	1	5 2	2	2	3.27	,	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45 44	2	0	1	2	2	2		****/ 225 ****/ 223	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
<ol> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> <li>Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	44	3	0	0	2	4	0		****/ 206	****	4.14 3.87	4.35 4.15	4.19 4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	44	3	U	U	4	4	U	3.07	/ 200		3.07	4.13	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	,	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	1	0	2	3	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	1	1	2	2	1		,	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	3	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	,	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	,	****	3.∠U ****	4.31	4.08	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	,	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	1	1	2	2	2		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
The state of the s		•	_	_	_	_	_		, 2,					

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)

Questionnaires: 53

Baltimore County Fall 2006

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 241

Enrollment: 62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0101 University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 242

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncie	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	938/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15			3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1095/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1372/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1497/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1007/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668				4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	864/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	986/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	969/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	1033/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	349/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	2	6	3.54	1142/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	0	1	7	3.46	1294/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	2	0	4	5	3.62	723/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.62
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00.07														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR Baltimore County

PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Instructor: OLSC Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

iversity of Maryland Page 243
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1																
1 Did vor	ı dəin ne	Genera. w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	938/	1669	3 99	3.81	4 23	4.02	4.23
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	993/		3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	2	8	2		1095/		3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.85
		ations reflect			1	2	2	1	1	2			1372/		3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.50
		eadings contribu			0	1	0	0	3	3			558/		4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.25
				what you learned	0	4	3	1	2	2			1497/		2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.67
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	3	6			1007/		3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.08
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0				825/		4.92	4.91	4.67		4.85
				ng effectiveness	1	3	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1274/	1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.04
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures		epared	2	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	1270/	1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22
		ctor seem intere			3	0	0	0	4	2	4		1404/		4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.40
		erial presented			3	0	0	2	2	3	3		1261/		4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.07
					2	1	1	3	2	2	2	3.10	1398/	1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understan					3	4	0	1	2	2				3.90				3.65
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu		at vou learned	0	0	3	1	1	2	6	3.54	1142/	1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.54
		nts actively end		-	0	0	1	2	0	3	7		1013/		4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00
				open discussion	0	0	4	1	0	1	7	3.46	1294/	1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.46
		echniques succes			0	0	2	2	0	4	5	3.62	723/	1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.62
		Self I	Paced																
1. Did sel	f-paced	system contribu		at vou learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
		ions make clear			12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
		acts with the in			12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
_		igh proctors for		_	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	29	***	****	4.34	4.22	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı										
Constitution To		G GDA		Towns at all Goods	_			D -										M	
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				кеа	asons	; 				Ту <u>г</u>	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Grad	duate	e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5				_				_	_		_	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	T				0	Und	er-gi	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0	,, ,,			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0			Means t				ın
				P 0							_	0	res	ponse	es to b	e sign	ıııcan	ιτ	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	2							
				3 0															

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 244

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LONGENBERGER, JE (Instr. C) Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 D;4	l wou goin	Genera new insights,ski		om thia aourao	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	938/1669	3.99	3.81	1 22	4.02	4.23
		uctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	930/1009	3.83	3.72	4.23	4.11	4.23
		questions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	8	_		1095/1421	3.67	3.49	4.19	4.11	3.85
		questions reflect luations reflect		_	1	2	2	1	1	2			1372/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15		3.50
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3			558/1555	4.13	3.43	4.13	3.92	4.25
	_	_		to what you learned	-	4	3	1	2	-			1497/1543		3.48	4.06	3.86	2.67
		ng system clearl			. 0	0	0	0	3	6			1007/1647		3.70		4.06	4.08
		s was class cand		ineu	0	0	0	0	0	2			825/1668		4.91			4.85
	_			ching effectiveness	-	-	0	0	1	5			918/1605	3.99			3.96	
J. 110.	would you	grade one overe		oning cricocriones.	, ,		Ū	Ü	_		_	1.00	310,1003	3.,,,	3.70	2.07	3.70	1.01
		Lectur	re															
1. Wer	e the inst	ructor's lecture	prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1160/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did	the instr	uctor seem inter	in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1083/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.40	
			explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	996/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.07	
4. Did	the lectu	res contribute t	6	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71		
5. Did	laudiovisu	al techniques en	your understanding	6	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	445/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.65	
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	2			1142/1490		3.53		3.85	3.54
				ed to participate	0	0	1	2	0	3			1013/1502		3.84		4.06	4.00
				nd open discussion	0	0	4	1	0	1	7		1294/1489		3.59		4.07	3.46
4. Wer	e special	techniques succe	esstul		0	0	2	2	0	4	5	3.62	723/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.62
		Self	Daged															
1. Did	self-pace			what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
		stions make clea			12		0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
		tacts with the i			12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	***
		ough proctors fo			12		0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
													,					
			Free	quency	y Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	\$			Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors		
00-27	· ' 6	0.00-0.99	A 7		P = .	auir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo	·	1	
28-55		1.00-1.99	1 0	B 5		Ke	quil	eu I	⊃⊥ I ^ν Ic	י זטני	D	U	Graduat	=	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	
26-33 56-83		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	12
84-15		3 00-3 49	0	D 0		GE	ııcı a	_				U	onder -g.	Luu 1		INOII	iia jui	14

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. D) Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 245

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ranl	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		n this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	938/1	669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.23
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	993/1		3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1095/1		3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.85
	_	uations reflect		_	1	2	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1372/1	617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1	555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.25
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	4	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1497/1	543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.67
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1007/1	647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.08
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1	668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	473/1	605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.04
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well m	prepared	6	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1199/1	514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1326/1	551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.40
				plained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	852/1	503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.07
		es contribute to			6	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1277/1	506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71
				our understanding	6	2	1	0	2	1	1		1072/1			3.57	3.85	3.68	3.65
		Discus	ni on																
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	2	6	3 54	1142/1	4 Q N	3.64	3 53	4.05	3.85	3.54
				d to participate	0	0	1	2	0	3	7		1013/1			3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00
				d open discussion	0	0	4	1	0	1	7		1294/1			3.59	4.29		3.46
		echniques succe		open discussion	0	0	2	2	0	4	5		723/1				4.00	3.81	
1	poorar o	Joinit queb Duebe	55242		Ü	Ü	_	_	Ü	-	J	3.02	, 23, 1		3.01	3.00	1.00	3.01	3.02
		Self :																	
				what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
		tions make clea			12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
_		acts with the i		_	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors for	r all th	ne students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	29	***	****	4.34	4.22	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ıtior	1										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5				Тур	pe			Majors	5
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	 1	 A 7			 quire		 or M=	ior		0	Grad			0	Majo		 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		1/6/	4u116	-u - t	) I 11C	ווטני	D	U	Grau	uace	-	U	Ma JC	) <u>+</u>	1
56-83		= -		Ger	neral					0	Unde:	r-ar	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	12		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		061		-				J	onae.	- 91	Luu I		14011		12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E14	ectiv	7es				0	####	_ 1\	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
craa.	0	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11.0	I	,				J			es to b				J
				I O		∩+1	ner				1	2	r csp.	0110		c pran	LLLCai		
				? 0		ULI	ICI					4							
				: U															

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201 University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 6

Page 246 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1371/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1466/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1516/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1410/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1321/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1172/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1270/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1210/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	219/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1036/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 246 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201 University of Maryland

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 6
Ouestionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 247

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 3.75 1371/1669 3.99 3.81 4.23 4.02 3.75 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 2 2 0 0 3.50 1466/1666 3.83 3.72 4.19 4.11 3.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 0 3 0 3.50 1222/1421 3.67 3.49 4.24 4.11 3.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 2 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 1516/1617 3.25 3.45 4.15 3.99 3.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 773/1555 4.13 3.79 4.00 3.92 4.00 0 1 0 3.00 1410/1543 2.83 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1321/1647 3.87 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.67 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1668 4.92 4.91 4.67 4.62 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 3 1 0 3.25 1455/1605 3.99 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.93 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 1199/1514 4.16 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.10 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 1270/1551 4.36 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.32 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 4 1 4.20 932/1503 4.10 3.91 4.24 4.17 4.13 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 770/1506 4.23 3.80 4.26 4.17 4.74 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 0 2 2 4.00 587/1311 3.90 3.57 3.85 3.68 4.15 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 3.75 1036/1490 3.64 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 1013/1502 4.00 3.84 4.26 4.06 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 1 2 1 0 3.00 1398/1489 3.23 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 479/1006 3.81 3.68 4.00 3.81 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** 0 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 4 0 0 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 1.00 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 Ω 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 4 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 0 0 1 0 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 4 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** Self Paced 4 0 0 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 4 01 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

4 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ****

Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 247 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201 University of Maryland Baltimore County Title

PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C) Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 248 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	0		1371/1669	3.99	3.81		4.02	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0		1466/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	0		1222/1421	3.67	3.49		4.11	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	0	0		1516/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0		1410/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	1			1321/1647		3.70	4.12	4.06	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1036/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	1		1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	0		1398/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	1		479/1006	3.81			3.81	
Laboratowy														
Laboratory	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 226	****	4 00	4 20	2 00	****
<ol> <li>Did the lab increase understanding of the material</li> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> </ol>	4 4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 226 ****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20 4.19	3.98 4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.06	4.19	4.42	****
•	4	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 223	****				****
<ol> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> <li>Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	4	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 206	****	4.14 3.87	4.35 4.15	4.19 4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	****/ 206		3.87	4.15	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
3 1														

Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 248 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
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	ι
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 249

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D) Fall 2006
Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	0		1371/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0		1466/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1516/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0		1410/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	1	0	1	0	1	1		1321/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	1		1404/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	1		1066/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	587/1311		3.57	3.85	3.68	4.15
5. Did didiovisual eccinitydes cimanee your understanding	_	_	Ü	Ü	-	_	_	1.00	30771311	3.70	3.37	3.03	3.00	1.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1036/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory														
<u>-</u>	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 226	****	4 00	4 20	2 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.02	4.20	3.98 4.09	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0		0	0	1		,	****		4.19		****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities				0			1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	^ ^ ^ ^	3.87	4.15	4.01	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
1. 10 11140 405100 00414 704 4120422 7041 07414401012	-	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	ŭ	2.00	, 10		3.00	3.77	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	***	****	4.34	4.22	****

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201 Title

PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Instructor: LONGENBERGER, JE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 6 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 249 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 59

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 250 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	37	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Overtien a						_	encie	s		Ins	tructo	or	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	ank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights, skills fr	om this course	1	0	5	11	6	11	3	2.89	1619,	/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.89
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear the e	xpected goals	1	0	6	9	9	7	5	2.89	1594	/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.89
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect the	expected goals	1	0	6	6	9	6	9	3.17	1332	/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect the e	xpected goals	2	14	3	6	4	6	2	2.90	1552	/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.90
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	2	1	1	2	6	14	11	3.94	872	/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.94
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contribute	to what you learned	2	21	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1355/	/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly expl	ained	2	0	3	5	8	13	6	3.40	1440,	/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	863,	/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.83
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	6	0	10	5	7	8	1	2.52	1560,	/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.16
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	7	6	6	13	5	3.08	1450	/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.36
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	6	26	4.46	1231,	/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.81
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	12	7	7	8	3	2.54	1469/	/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.19
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	0	1	17	1	10	7	1	2.28	1481,	/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.49
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	0	4	12	2	6	9	4	2.73	1201,	/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.89
		Discussion																
1. Did cl	id class discussions contribute to what you learne				0	12	5	5	10	5	2.76	1404	/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.76
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate				0	5	1	4	8	19	3.95	1075	/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	6	3	10	9	9	3.32	1345	/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.32
4. Were s	. Were special techniques successful				1	6	2	8	8	12	3.50	759,	/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.50
		Laboratory																
		crease understanding		29	0	1	5	1	0	1	2.38	****		****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
		ded with adequate bac		30	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****		****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
	_	materials available		30	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****		****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
		structor provide assi		31	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	,		****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab reports c	learly specified	31	1	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****	/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
		Seminar																
	_	topics relevant to th		35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****		****	****	4.38	4.04	****
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made clea	r	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****	/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
		Self Paced																
		system contribute to		36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****	/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
		tions make clear the		36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****	/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
_		acts with the instruc	_	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00			****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was th	ie feedba	ck/tutoring by procto	rs helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****	/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
	Fre					strib	utic	n										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Re	eason	.s				Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 8				 R <i>⊂</i>	anir	ed f	or M	 la ior		1	 Gra	 aduat	 e	 0	Majo	 r	1
	28-55 9 1.00-1.99 0 B 12				110	-1411	- Cu I		⊥∪ر ما	2	-	016	-auuc	_	5	1100	-	_
	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 9				Ge	nera	1				0	Unc	der-g	rad '	37	Non-	major	36
84-150							_				-	0110	3				,	
Grad.					El	ecti	ves				0	###	## - 1	Means t	there a	re not	enou	ah
P 0															oe sign			-
	Р 0 I 0					her				3	31		-					
	I 0																	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0101
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 37 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 5 11 6 11 3 2.89 1619/1669 3.16 3.81 4.23 4.02 2.89 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 6 9 9 7 5 2.89 1594/1666 3.09 3.72 4.19 4.11 2.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 6 6 9 6 9 3.17 1332/1421 3.18 3.49 4.24 4.11 3.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 14 3 6 4 6 2 2.90 1552/1617 2.96 3.45 4.15 3.99 2.90 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 2 6 14 11 3.94 872/1555 3.61 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.94 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 21 2 2 3 5 2 3.21 1355/1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.21 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 3 5 8 13 6 3.40 1440/1647 3.43 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 6 29 4.83 863/1668 4.89 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.83 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 3 15 8 2 3.32 1432/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.16 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 12 0 3 4 3 7 8 3.52 1385/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 3.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 3 3 3 6 11 3.73 1469/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 3.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 4 1 6 6 5 3.32 1384/1503 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.19 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 1 7 3 3 6 1 2.55 1452/1506 3.13 3.80 4.26 4.17 2.49 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 6 2 3 6 2 3 3.06 1108/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 2.89 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 12 5 5 10 5 2.76 1404/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 2.76 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 5 1 4 8 19 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 6 3 10 9 9 3.32 1345/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.324. Were special techniques successful 0 1 6 2 8 8 12 3.50 759/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.50 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29 0 1 5 1 0 1 2.38 **** 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 2 1 2 1 1 2.71 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 **** 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 2 0 1 3 0 2.83 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 1 2 0 2 0 1 2.60 **** 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 35 1 0 35 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  $36\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1.00$  ****/  $42\ ****$  3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 36 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 **** / 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 36 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 00-27 Major 28-55 9 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 7 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 в 12 C 9 D 1 C 9 General 0 Under-grad 37 Non-major 36 F 1 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 31

Fall 2006

Page 251

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 59

Questionnaires: 37

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 252 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

						_	ncie		_		tructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
	Questions		NR 	NA 	1 	2 	3 	-4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
	General															
	ew insights, skills from thi		1	0	5	11	6	11	3		1619/1669		3.81		4.02	2.8
	ctor make clear the expecte		1	0	6	9	9	7	5		1594/1666		3.72	4.19	4.11	2.8
_	questions reflect the expect		1	0	6	6	9	6	9		1332/1421		3.49	4.24	4.11	3.1
	uations reflect the expecte	-	2	14	3	6	4	6	2		1552/1617		3.45	4.15	3.99	2.9
_	eadings contribute to what	-	2	1	1	2	6	14	11		872/1555		3.79	4.00	3.92	3.9
	signments contribute to wha	at you learned	2	21	2	2	3	5	2		1355/1543			4.06	3.86	3.2
_	g system clearly explained		2	0	3	5	8	13	6		1440/1647		3.70	4.12	4.06	3.4
_	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	6			863/1668		4.91	4.67	4.62	
9. How would you	grade the overall teaching	effectiveness	21	4	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1480/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.1
	Lecture															
1. Were the instr	uctor's lectures well prepa	ared	26	0	3	0	3	3	2	3.09	1449/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.3
2. Did the instru	ctor seem interested in the	subject	27	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1513/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.8
3. Was lecture ma	terial presented and explai	ned clearly	28	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	****/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.1
4. Did the lectur	es contribute to what you l	earned	27	0	5	1	2	0	2	2.30	1479/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.4
5. Did audiovisua	l techniques enhance your u	understanding	28	3	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	****/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.8
	Discussion															
1. Did class disc	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you lear					5	5	10	5	2.76	1404/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.7
	Were all students actively encouraged to participa					1	4	8	19		1075/1502		3.84	4.26	4.06	3.9
	were all students actively encouraged to participa Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss						10	9	9		1345/1489		3.59	4.29	4.07	3.3
	echniques successful		0	1	6	2	8	8	12	3.50	759/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.5
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab in	crease understanding of the	material	29	0	1	5	1	0	1	2.38	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	***
	ded with adequate backgroun		30	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 233		4.08	4.19	4.09	***
	materials available for la		30	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/ 225		4.35	4.50	4.42	***
_	structor provide assistance		31	0	2	0	1	3	0		****/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.19	***
	ents for lab reports clearly		31	1	2	0	2	0	1		****/ 206		3.87	4.15	4.01	***
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned	topics relevant to the anno	nunced theme	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	***
	for grading made clear	Julioua ollomo	35	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98		****	3.95	3.90	***
J. More Orrectia	Tor grading made ordar		33	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, , ,	•		3.75	3.70	
1 54164	Self Paced	]	2.0	0	1	0	0	0	^	1 00	++++/	; ****	2 40	1 21	1 17	+++
	system contribute to what		36 36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,		3.40	4.34	4.17	***
	tions make clear the expect		36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42 ****/ 46		3.∠U ****	4.31	4.08	***
	acts with the instructor he ck/tutoring by proctors hel		36	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 33		****	4.45	4.26 4.25	***
	3 1 1															
	Frequ	ency	Dis	trıb	ut10	n										
Credits Earned	spected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	рe			Majors	3	
00-27 3	A 8		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s	1	 Graduat	:e	0	Majo	 or	1	
28-55 9	B 12 C 9		C =	2022	1				0	IIndo	mad 1	7	No-	mo i o	26	
56-83 3 84-150 2	C 9 D 1		Ge	nera	Т				U	Under-9	jrau :	37	non-	-major	36	
Grad. 0	F 1		El	ecti	ves				0		Means t			_	jh	
	P 0								2	1	respons	ses to b	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0								3	_						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0101
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 37

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 253

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 5 11 6 11 3 2.89 1619/1669 3.16 3.81 4.23 4.02 2.89 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 6 9 9 7 5 2.89 1594/1666 3.09 3.72 4.19 4.11 2.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 6 6 9 6 9 3.17 1332/1421 3.18 3.49 4.24 4.11 3.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 14 3 6 4 6 2 2.90 1552/1617 2.96 3.45 4.15 3.99 2.90 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 2 6 14 11 3.94 872/1555 3.61 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.94 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 21 2 2 3 5 2 3.21 1355/1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.21 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 3 5 8 13 6 3.40~1440/1647~3.43~3.70~4.12~4.06~3.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 6 29 4.83~863/1668~4.89~4.91~4.67~4.62~4.839. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 5 0 2 5 10 2 3.63 1293/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.16 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 22 0 1 2 3 3 6 3.73 1330/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 3.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 20 0 1 2 4 3 7 3.76 1466/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 3.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 23 0 1 1 4 3 5 3.71 1255/1503 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.19 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 24 0 3 3 2 2.85 1427/1506 3.13 3.80 4.26 4.17 2.49 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 23 5 0 2 3 1 3 3.56 ****/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 2.89 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 12 5 5 10 5 2.76 1404/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 2.76 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 5 1 4 8 19 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 6 3 10 9 9 3.32 1345/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.32 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 6 2 8 8 12 3.50 759/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.50 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29 0 1 5 1 0 1 2.38 **** 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 2 1 2 1 1 2.71 **** 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 **** 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 2 0 1 3 0 2.83 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 1 2 0 2 0 1 2.60 **** 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 35 1 0 35 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 36 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 36 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 46 *** *** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 36 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 33 *** *** 4.25 4.25 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 00-27 Major 28-55 9 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 7 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 B 12 C 9 D 1 C 9 General 0 Under-grad 37 Non-major 36 F 1 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Other

31

I 0

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Instructor:

Enrollment: 66

PERKS, H. MARK (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 254 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	56	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	n Questionnaire
-----------------	----	-----------------------------------------	-----------------

			Frequencies I			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	22	19	7	2 20	1532/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	20	20	8		1502/1666	3.10	3.72	4.19	4.02	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	16	15	11		1261/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	8	14	7	1		1562/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	4	12	13	17		1062/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	2	5	6	6	3		1382/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	15	13	15		1377/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	3	2	16	16	7	3.50	1357/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	6	12	18	16	3.69	1343/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	3	7	43		1069/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	19	11	12		1380/1503	3.43	3.91		4.17	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	4	8	4	12	18	8		1371/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	7	2	12	9	15	3.51	934/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39
Discussion				_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	5	14	15	14		1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	10	13	23		1117/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	7	13	14	14		1310/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	4	4	18	8	16	3.56	741/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	,	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88		****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	2	0	1	2	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar	<b>5</b> 4	0	0	•		0	0	F 00	**** / 110	de de de de	4.4.4.4	4 20	4 0 4	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	0	0	0	0	0 1	2 1	5.00 4.50	,	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
	54 54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	, -	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54 54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	****	****	4.22	3.79 3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	****	****	3.95	3.94	***
• •									,					
Field Work	г 4	0	1	^	0	1	0	0 50	**** / FO		2 00	4 00	4 00	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	,	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00		****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1 0	0	0	0 1	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 39 ****/ 40	****	3.00	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54 54	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	3.97 4.33	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 30			4.33	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	,	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	,	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

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

Enrollment: 66 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 254 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 56 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	В	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	41				
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

66

Questionnaires: 56

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 255 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eane	ncie	g		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	22	19	7	3.38	1532/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	20	20	8		1502/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	16	15	11	3.43	1261/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	8	14	7	1		1562/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	4	12	13	17		1062/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	2	5	6	6	3		1382/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	15	13	15		1377/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	2	5	22	9	4	3.19	1472/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	5	13	11	15	3.70	1343/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	2	2	5	15	24	4.19	1364/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	6	11	19	7	3.51	1327/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	6	8	9	14	9		1374/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	11	2	3	13	6	7	3.42	989/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	5	14	15	14	3.48	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	10	13	23	3.91	1117/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	7	13	14	14	3.43	1310/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	4	4	18	8	16	3.56	741/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.56
Laboratory			_			_	_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	1	0	4	2	1		****/ 226	***	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	2	3		****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	2	1 2	4		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50 49	0 1	2	0	1	1	1 2		****/ 223 ****/ 206	****	4.14 3.87	4.35 4.15	4.19 4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	U	U	3	Т	۷	3.03	/ 206		3.07	4.15	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 66

Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 255 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	А	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	В	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	41				
				?	1						

66

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

Enrollment:

GRIMM, IVY

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 256 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	56	Student Course	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	----------------	--------------	---------------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	22	19	7	3.38	1532/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	20	20	8	3.43	1502/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	16	15	11	3.43	1261/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	8	14	7	1	2.85	1562/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	4	12	13	17	3.76	1062/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	2	5	6	6	3		1382/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	15	13	15		1377/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	7	3	0	4	14	5	3.69	1255/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	4	3	11			1307/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	4	4	7	14		1419/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	3	2	7	10	7		1315/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	1	2	0	7	13	6		1243/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	11	2	1	6	2	4	3.33	1027/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39
Discussion			_	_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	5	14	15	14		1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	10	13	23		1117/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0 4	6 4	7	13 18	14	14		1310/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	4	4	18	8	16	3.56	741/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	2	3		****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	2	1	4		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	2	0	1	2	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar		_	_											
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 112	***	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0 0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	54 54	0	0	0	0	1	1 2		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	****	4.20 3.95	3.94 3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	34	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	/ 90			3.95	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	* * * *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 66

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 256 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	В	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	С	14	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	41				
				?	1						

66

CHEM 102 0102

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)

Questionnaires: 56

Enrollment:

Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County Page 257 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

)

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	22	19	7	3.38	1532/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	20	20	8		1502/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	16	15	11	3.43	1261/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	8	14	7	1	2.85	1562/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	4	12	13	17	3.76	1062/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	2	5	6	6	3	3.14	1382/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	15	13	15	3.55	1377/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	5	1	3	11	8	0	3.13	1488/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	1	5	4	6	6	3.50	1389/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	4	0	7	8	5	3.42	1499/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	4	1	8	5	5	3.26	1392/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	2	3	4	7	4	5	3.17	1388/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	5	3	0	9	1	5		1051/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	5	14	15	14	3 49	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	10	13	23		1117/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	7	13	14	14		1310/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	4	4	18	8			741/1006			4.00		3.56
1. Were special techniques successful	2	-	ī	I	10	O	10	3.30	741/1000	3.07	3.00	4.00	3.01	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
	-		-	-	-	-	·		,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Course Section: CHEM 102 0102 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 66 Questionnaires: 56 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	В	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	41	_			
				?	1						

Page 257

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

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

Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 49 Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 258 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
******														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	7	15	10	10	3.23	1570/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	16	11	8	3.14	1561/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	7	7	11	13	8	3.17	1329/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	6	9	9	7	4	2.83	1565/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	5	3	17	11	3.52	1217/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	6	6	5	7	0	2.54	1510/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	6	11	14	11	3.53	1381/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	5	1	0	1	1	41	4.84	825/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	10	7	11	8	2	2.61	1555/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	11	10	10	7	9	2.85	1476/1514	3,64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	5	5	10	26		1391/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	14	13	5	11	5		1465/1503		3.91	4.24	4.17	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	7	17	6	4	8	6		1456/1506		3.80	4.26	4.17	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	10	11	4	6			1167/1311				3.68	
5. Did addiovisadi ecciniiques cinianee your understanding	5	3	10		-	O	10	2.00	1107/1311	3.20	3.37	3.03	3.00	3.31
Discussion					_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	12	4	7	7	16		1274/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	3.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	6	5	10	20		1179/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	8	8	18		1253/1489		3.59	4.29	4.07	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	3	3	7	9	19	3.93	581/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	2	0		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	1	0	3	0		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
o. More requirements for the reports ofeder, specified	15	ŭ	Ü	_	Ü	J	Ü	3.30	, 200		3.07	1.15	1.01	
Seminar					_		_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
2 ny 1 mara 1 ma		-		-	-	-	-							

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

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

Questionnaires: 49

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 258 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33	_			
				?	3						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 70

Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 259 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	7	15	10	10	3.23	1570/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	16	11	8	3.14	1561/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	7	7	11	13	8	3.17	1329/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	6	9	9	7	4	2.83	1565/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	5	3	17	11		1217/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	6	6	5	7	0		1510/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3 1	6 0	11	14	11		1381/1647	3.43		4.12	4.06	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 11	5 0	2	6	1 16	1 11	41 3	4.84	825/1668 1475/1605	4.89 3.40	4.91 3.76	4.67 4.07	4.62 3.96	4.84 3.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	ТТ	U	۷	0	10	TT	3	3.10	14/5/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.90	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	4	6	8	6	14		1385/1514	3.64		4.39	4.32	3.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	2	2	6	8	20		1391/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	5	5	5	12	12		1321/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	2	8	5	5	7	12		1372/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	3	7	7	10	7	3.32	1032/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	12	4	7	7	16	3.24	1274/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	6	5	10	20		1179/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	8	8	18		1253/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	3	3	7	9	19	3.93	581/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	***	****	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 49

70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

# Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA		d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	10	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	3						

Page 259

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

70

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 49

Enrollment:

GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 260 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
-															
	General														
1	. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	7	15	10	10	3.23	1570/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.23
2	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	16	11	8	3.14	1561/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.14
3	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	7	7	11	13	8	3.17	1329/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17
4	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	6	9	9	7	4	2.83	1565/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.83
5	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	5	3	17	11	3.52	1217/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.52
6	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	6	6	5	7	0	2.54	1510/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.54
7	. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	6	11	14	11	3.53	1381/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.53
8	. How many times was class cancelled	0	5	1	0	1	1	41	4.84	825/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.84
9	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	2	2	1	5	9	6	3.70	1255/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38
	Lecture														
1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	3	1	4	3	11	3.82	1303/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.52
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	3	0	5	4	12		1439/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.03
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	3	2	4	7	7		1312/1503		3.91	4.24	4.17	3.38
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	5	0	4	6	8		1315/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.24
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	3	2	1	8	3	4		1027/1311		3.57			3.31
	Discussion														
1	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	12	4	7	7	16	2 24	1274/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.24
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	6	5	10	20		1179/1502	3.24	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.80
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	8	8	18		1253/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.00	3.57
		3	5	3	3	7	9	19		581/1006				3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful				3	3	,	9	19	3.93	301/1000	3.07	3.00	4.00	3.01	3.93
	Laboratory														
1	. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	***
2	. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	***
	. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	***
4	. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	***
	. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
	Seminar														
1	. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
	. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
	. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	***
	Field Work														
1	Field work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
					•		-	0		,	****				***
	. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	•		****/ 52		4.00	4.06	3.81	****
	. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****		4.39	4.30	****
	. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5	. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	1	U	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
	Self Paced														
	. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
	. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
	. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4	. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 70

Fall 2006

Page 260 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 49

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	redits Earned Cum			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	10	General		Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 261 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	7	15	10	10	3.23	1570/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	16	11	8	3.14	1561/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	7	7	11	13	8	3.17	1329/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	6	9	9	7	4	2.83	1565/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	5	3	17	11	3.52	1217/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	6	6	5	7	0	2.54	1510/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	6	11	14	11		1381/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	5	1	0	1	1	41	4.84		4.89		4.67	4.62	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	2	0	0	6	8	7	4.05		3.40		4.07	3.96	3.38
,														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	1	7	2	12	3.88	1281/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	0	8	4	11		1404/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	1	2	6	6	9		1197/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	3	1	5	7	8		1277/1506		3.80	4.26	4.17	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	4	1	3	4	5	7							3.31
5. Fix additional techniques emance your anderstanding	23	-	-	3	-	3	,	3.70	010/1311	3.20	3.37	3.03	3.00	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	12	4	7	7	16	3.24	1274/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	6	5	10	20		1179/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	8	8	18		1253/1489	3.46	3.59		4.07	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	3	3	7	9	19	3.93		3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.93
1. Note Special committees Successive			J		•			3.73	301,1000	3.07	5.00	1.00	3.01	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	2	1	0	1	1			****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	2	0		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	1	0	3	0		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
o. Here requirements for tax reports creating specified	10	·	ŭ	_	ŭ		Ū	3.30	, 200		3.07	1.15	1.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0		,	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)

Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 261 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	10	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33	_			
				?	3						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

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

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 42

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 262

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 6 6 12 12 6 3.14 1583/1669 3.16 3.81 4.23 4.02 3.14 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1. 3 5 10 7 14 2 2.95 1372/1421 3.18 3.49 4.24 4.11 2.95 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1. 15 3 2 8 11 2 3.77 1470/1617 2.96 3.45 4.15 3.99 3.77 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did availy of the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Here special techniques successful 4. Here special techniques accessful 5. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Did the lab instructor of lab reports clearly specified 7.					_	ncie		_		tructor	Course	_			Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignents contribute to what you learned 7. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 9. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did sasigned reading system clearly explained 9. Did would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Discussion 2. Lebera Discussion 2. Lebera Discussion 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did would be a provided with adequate background information 4. Were the instructor a	Questions	NR 	NA 		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 3 5 10 7 11 14 2 2.88 1594/1666 5.09 3.72 4.19 4.11 2.85 3. Did other evan quastions reflect the expected goals 1 15 3 2 8 11 2 2.95 1377/1421 3.18 3.49 4.2 4.11 2.85 5. Did ossigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1 6 4 10 1 5 3.21 3187/1542 3.61 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.71 5. Did ossigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 6 4 10 1 3 5 3.21 3187/1552 3.61 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.71 5. Did ossigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 5 7 1 3.02 1501/1647 3.43 3.70 4.10 4.06 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 2 12 8 11 7 3.22 1501/1647 3.43 3.70 4.10 4.06 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	General														
3. bid the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 3 5 10 7 14 2 2.95 1372/1412 3.18 3.49 4.24 4.11 2.95 4.0	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	6	12	12	6	3.14	1583/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 15 3 2 8 11 14 5 3.1 470.1617 2.96 3.45 4.15 3.99 3.27 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 10 6 4 10 14 5 3.21 1383.1555 3.61 3.79 4.00 3.22 3.21 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 20 3 3 6 7 1 3.00 1410.1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 2 20 3 3 6 7 1 3.00 1410.1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 2 20 3 0 1 0 1 3 5 4.89 731.1668 4.89 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 10 7 7 1 2 1 2.65 1551.1665 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.66 **Lecture** 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 8 2 10 9 13 3.40 1407/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.02 2. Did the instructor seem interpreted in the subject 0 0 2 4 6 7 23 4.07 1394/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.34 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 14 8 6 8 6 2.62 1462/1503 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 2 19 2 6 8 5 2.45 1464/1506 3.13 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 14 1 3 13 7 2.95 1142/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.49 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 0 1 1 0 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4.08 4.08 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	11	14	2	2.88	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 1 6 6 4 10 14 5 3.21 1383/1555 3.61 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.21 6. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 0 3 3 6 7 1 3.00 1410/1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 2 0 2 12 8 11 7 3.22 1501/1647 3.43 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 3 0 1 1 0 1 35 4.89 731/1668 4.89 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 10 7 7 7 12 1 2.65 1551/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.66		1	3	5	10	7		2	2.95	1372/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 20 3 3 3 6 7 1 3.00 1410/1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 2 0 2 12 8 11 7 3.22 1501/1647 3.43 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 3 0 0 1 0 1 35 4.89 731/1668 4.89 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 10 7 7 12 1 2.65 1551/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.66			15					2						3.99	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 2 12 8 11 7 3.22 150/1647 3.43 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 3 0 1 1 5 5 4.89 731/1668 4.99 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 10 7 7 12 1 2.65 1551/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.66															
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 10 7 7 12 35 4.89 731/1668 4.89 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 10 7 7 12 1 2.65 1551/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.66 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 8 2 10 9 13 3.40 1407/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.02 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 2 4 6 7 23 4.07 1394/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.34 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 14 8 6 8 6 2.62 1462/1503 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 2 19 2 6 8 5 2.45 1464/1506 3.13 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 14 1 3 13 7 2.95 1142/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.34 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.00 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 0 0 1 3.00 ***/ 225 *** 4.08 4.19 4.09 *** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.00 ***/ 205 *** 4.08 4.19 4.09 *** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.00 ***/ 205 *** 4.08 4.19 4.09 *** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ***/ 205 *** 4.08 4.19 4.09 *** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.50 ***/ 97 *** 4.24 2.379 *** 6. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 *** 4.22 3.79 *** 6. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 *** 4.02 4.20 3.94 *** 7. Did field experience contribute to what you lea															
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 10 7 7 12 1 2.65 1551/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.66 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 8 2 10 9 13 3.40 1407/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.02 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 2 4 6 7 23 4.07 1394/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.34 3.08 slecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 14 8 6 8 6 2.62 1462/1503 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 2 19 2 6 8 5 2.65 1462/1503 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 2 14 1 3 13 7 2.95 1142/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.34 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 2 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 3 5 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.69 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 1 2 2 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ***/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ***/ 225 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 206 **** 4.14 4.05 4.01 **** 2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 97 **** 4.14 4.02 4.20 3.94 **** 3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 **** 4.23 4.09 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 **** 4.23 4.00 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria															
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Were special techniques successful 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Were you provided with adequate background information 8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Did was available for individual attention 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. O 1 1 0 2 2 0 2.67 ***/ 283 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. O 2 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. O 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. O 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 233 **** 4.18 4.04 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. O 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 23 **** 4.18 4.04 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. O 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 28 **** 4.38 4.04 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. Did recearch projects contribute to what you learned 3. O 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 25 **** 4.35 4.09 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3. O 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 25 **** 4.35 4.09 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3. Did recearch projects contribute to what you learned 3				•											
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 8 2 10 9 13 3.40 1407/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.02 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 2 4 6 7 23 4.07 1394/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.34 3.84 3.84 1401 1394 151 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.34 3.84 1401 1401 1401 1401 1401 1401 1401 14	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	10	7	7	12	Τ	2.65	1551/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Were special techniques understanding of the material 8. Were pour provided with adequate background information 8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did green clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to wh	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Discussion 8. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 9. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9. Were criteria for grading made clear 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experien			-												
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 2 19 2 6 8 5 2.45 1464/1506 3.13 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 14 1 3 13 7 2.95 1142/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.34 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 2 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ***/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 3.80 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ***/ 223 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 4.01 4.10 10 3.20 ***/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4.01 4.01 1.01 1.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01															
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.68 3.34 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 2 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 Eaboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 0 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.51 ***/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.05 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 226 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 98 **** 4.42 3.94 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.50 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39															
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 2 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 3 5 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.69 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 0 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** *** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 5. Did specentations contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0								_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 2.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 2 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3.01 dhe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	14	1	3	13	./	2.95	1142/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.34
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 2 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4.04 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 3 5 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.69 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 2 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****							13	10			3.24	3.53		3.85	
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 *** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 *** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****						-									
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made vealuation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****			-		-										
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ***/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.79 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 *** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.39 4.30 ****	4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	5	7	10	14	3.69	677/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 **** 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 **** 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 **** 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 **** 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 **** 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 97 *** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 4. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.50 **** 97 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 3.00 **** 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****	Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.20 3.79 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ***/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****								0	3.20	****/ 233		4.08	4.19		
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****		37					0	1	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****	-		-	-	-		-	-		, -					
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****	Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****										, -					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****				-			-	•		,					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****	-									,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****	Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 ****								0		,		3.80	4.22	4.00	
								0	3.00	, 52	****			3.81	
								-		,					
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 ****								-		,					
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 ****	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced	Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 ****	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0		1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 ****							-	0		,				4.08	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 $$ 1 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 2.00 ****/ $$ 46 **** $$ **** $$ 4.45 $$ 4.26 $$ ****	-									, 10					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****	* · · ·							-		, 55					
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ****	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

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

Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 262 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum.			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	С	14	General		Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	3						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 42

52

Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 263 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	6	12	12	6	3.14	1583/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	11	14	2	2.88	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	5	10	7	14	2	2.95	1372/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	2	8	11	2	3.27	1470/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	4	10	14	5	3.21	1383/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	3	6	7	1	3.00	1410/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	12	8	11	7	3.22	1501/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	1	0	1	35	4.89	731/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	3	23	5	3.82	1156/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	3	5	9	15	Δ 12	1160/1514	3 64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	5	10	17		1284/1551	4.06	4.13	4.66	4.55	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	8	9	12		1106/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	4	4	1	14	7		1313/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	3	1	9	8	5		983/1311		3.57	3.85		3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	3	Τ	9	8	5	3.42	983/1311	3.28	3.5/	3.85	3.08	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	7	13	10	3.49	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.49
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	15	14	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	14	10	10	3.51	1274/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	5	7	10	14	3.69	677/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.69
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	1	1	2	2	0	2 02	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.02	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	0	3	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	5	0	0		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	1	1		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.19	****
J. Were requirements for rap reports crearry specified	57	U	U	U	3	1		3.00	/ 200		3.07	4.13	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	2	1	0	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
5. 214 compared help for cally out field acciving	0,0	ŭ	_	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	2.55	, 30			1.55	1.50	
Self Paced		_	_	_	_	_	_		=					
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.73		****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	0	2	0	0			****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	5.00		****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 263 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	3						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GRIMM, IVY

(Instr. C) Fall 2006

Baltimore County

Page 264

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions		Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
1. Did you gain new insishts,skills from this course 0	Questions	NR	NA		_			5				_			
1. Did you gain new insishts,skills from this course 0															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0		0	0	6	6	1 2	1 2	6	2 1/	1502/1660	2 16	2 01	1 22	4 02	2 1/
3. 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1										,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. 2 0 2 1 2 8 1 1 7 1 3.00 1410/1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 2 0 2 1 2 8 1 1 7 1 3.00 1410/1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 2 0 2 1 2 8 1 1 7 1 3.00 1410/1543 2.97 3.48 4.06 3.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 3 1 0 0 1 2 1 2 8 1 1 7 13 3.00 1410/1543 3.97 3.40 4.0 4.0 3.22 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 18. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 19. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 19. City 10 1 2 2 2 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1															
5. Did assigned readines contribute to what you learned 2															
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. The would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. The would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. The would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. The would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. The would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 12. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 13. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 15. Did addiovisual teaching presented and explained clearly 16. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 17. Did class discoussions contribute to what you learned 18. Discussion 19. Did class discoussions contribute to what you learned 19. Where special teachingues successful 20. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 22. Did the lab increases understanding of the material 23. Did the lab increases understanding of the material 24. Where you provided with adequate background information 25. Where necessary materials available for lab activities 27. Where requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28. Where requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29. Where all specified															
7. Nas the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 10 1 3 7 3.22 1501/1647 3.43 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.22 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 2 3 0 1 0 1 3 1 8 4.89 731/1658 4.89 3.71/1658 3.89 4.91/1658 3.89 3.70/1658 3.89 3.70/1658 3.89 3.70/1658 3.89 3.70/1658 3.89 3.71/1658 3.89 3.70/1658 3.89 3.70/1658 3.89 3.71/1658 3.71/165								-							
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 3 0 1 0 0 1 35 4.89 731/1668 4.89 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 3 0 0 1 0 2 12 8 8 4.13 820/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.66 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 18 0 1 1 3 7 12 4.17 1136/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.02 2.01 dithe instructor seem interested in the subject 20 0 0 0 5 3 14 4.41 1270/1551 4.06 4.36 4.65 4.55 4.34 3.08 lecture material presented and explained clearly 18 0 1 2 3 8 10 4.00 1066/1503 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.67 4.01 dithe lectures contribute to what you learned 19 1 2 2 2 8 8 10 4.00 1066/1503 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.67 4.01 dithe lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.91 1045/1311 3.28 3.57 3.65 3.68 3.34 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.52 4.05 3.85 3.49 2.02 4.07 3.51 3.03 104 4.01 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 1															
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 3 1 0 2 12 8 4.13 820/1605 3.40 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.66															
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. O 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. O 5 0 14 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.05 3.85 3.49 2. Were special techniques successful 3. O 5 0 14 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.05 3.85 3.49 3. Were necessary metricals available for lab activities 3. Were necessary metricals available for lab activities 3. Were recessary metricals available for lab activities 3. Were recessary metricals available for lab activities 3. Were representations contribute to what you learned 3. Were representations contribute to what you learned 3. Were representation of lab activities 3. Were representation available for lab activities 3. Were prepared to pick relevant to the announced theme 3. Were representation available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activi	-			-											
1. Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared 18				_	Ü	_		Ü	1.15	020, 2003	3.10	3.70	1.07	3.30	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 20 0 0 0 5 5 3 1 4 4.41 1270/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.34 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 18 0 1 2 2 8 8 8 3.82 1219/1506 3.13 3.43 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 19 1 2 2 2 8 8 8 3.82 1219/1506 3.13 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19 6 2 2 5 5 5 3 3.29 1045/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.34 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19 1 2 2 2 8 8 8 3.82 1219/1506 3.13 3.80 4.26 4.07 3.48 101 class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.68 3.34 101 class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.69 101 class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.69 101 class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 7 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ***/ 223 *** 4.02 4.20 3.98 ***/ 226 *** 4.02 4.20 3.98 ***/ 228 ***/ 226 *** 4.02 4.20 3.98 ***/ 228 ***/															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussion Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion on the participate of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion on the participate of the participate of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion on the participate of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion on the participate of the particip			-			-									
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19 6 2 2 2 5 5 3 3.29 1045/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.49 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 5 4 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.13 3.80 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 1 1 2 2 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.88 ****/ 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 225 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 ****/ 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 ****/ 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 ****/ 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** 4.22 4.00 ****/ 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.22 4.00 ****// 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.23 4.34 4.17 ****// 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.23 4.30 ****// 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.24 4.00 ****// 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.24 4.00 ****// 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.24 4.00 ****// 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 *** 3.40 4.34 4.17 ****// 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 *** 3.40 4.34 4.17 ****// 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ***/ 55 *** 3.40 4.34 4.17 ***	-														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19 6 2 2 5 5 5 3 3 3.29 1045/1311 3.28 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.34 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 2 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 5 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.69 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 0 2.83 ***/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.81 3.69 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ***/ 233 *** 4.08 4.19 4.09 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.00 ***/ 225 **** 4.05 4.54 4.19 *** 4. Did the lab intructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 *** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 207 *** 4.15 4.01 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 97 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 98 **** 4.20 3.94 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 98 **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 3 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.39 4.00 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ***/ 40 **** 4.39 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 0 2 0 0 2.33 ***/ 40 **** 4.39 4.31 4.08 **** 8. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ***/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 39 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															
Discussion								-							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 5 4 7 13 10 3.49 1166/1490 3.24 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.49 2 Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.28 4.06 3.95 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.28 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 5 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.69 Laboratory La	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1045/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.34
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 2 6 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 14 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 5 0 1 10 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 5 0 1 1 10 3.51 1274/1489 3.46 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.51	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 2 6 6 15 14 3.95 1075/1502 3.90 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 7 10 14 3.69 677/1006 3.67 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.69 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 2 2 0 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2.84 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 2.84 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 2.84 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ***/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 2.84 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** 2.84 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2.84 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** 4.26 4.19 **** 4.54 4.19 4.54 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** 4.23 3.79 **** 4.54 4.10 **** 2.84 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2.84 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2.84 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ***/ 98 **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 4.30 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 4.30 4.30 **** 4.55 4.50 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.3		3	0	5	4	7	13	10	3.49	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9. West hinstructor available for individual attention 9. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9. Were criteria for grading made clear 9. Were criteria for grading made clear 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9. Did you clearly understand your evaluation size of the proof of the material 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Did study questions mak															
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3. Vere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3. Vere assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Did presents for grading made clear 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Did presents and your evaluation criteria 3. Were criteria for grading was elear the expected goal 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to hat you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to hat you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to hat you learned 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did self-paced sys															
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 1 2 2 0 2.83 ****/ 226 **** 4.02 4.20 3.98 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** 4.36 4.19 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 3. Did conferences contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.09 3.79 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** 4.39 4.30 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** 4.45 4.25 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by protors helpful 39 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 *															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 1 1 1 2 2 0 0 2.83 ****															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 0 4 1 0 3.20 **** / 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.09 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 **** / 223 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.00 **** / 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 **** / 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 3.33 **** / 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** / 97 **** *** 4.36 4.19 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.50 **** / 92 **** *** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** / 98 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** Pield Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** / 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Pield work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** / 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** / 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** / 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 **** / 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 **** / 40 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 0 1 0 3 0 1 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.35 4.50 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/ 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** 4.25 4.29 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.50 ****/ 98 **** 4.20 3.79 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** 4.39 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 2.33 ****/ 40 **** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ***/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.25 4.25 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.25 4.25 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.25 4.25 ****	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 37 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 **** 223 **** 4.14 4.35 4.19 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 37 0 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 **** 206 **** 3.87 4.15 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 97 *** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 97 *** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 92 *** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.50 **** 92 *** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 **** 98 *** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 98 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****	3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 38 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 3.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 *** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 40 *** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ***/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.55 4.25 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.55 4.25 ****	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37			-		0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** *** 4.25 4.25 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.25 4.25 ****		38	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 38 2 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.25 4.25 **** 4.00 4.45 4.25 ****										,	****	****			****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 38 1 0 2 1 0 0 2.33 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 38 1 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****										,	****	****			****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.90 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.25 4.25 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****				0			0	0	2.33	, -	****	****			****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 46 *** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ***/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****	-									,	****	****			****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 46 *** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ***/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 3 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ***/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****	-														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 39 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****							-	-		,					
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****							-	-		, 55					
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****								-		,					
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****			0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****	Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 39 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****			0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 39 1 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****		39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 39 0 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****			1		0		0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****		4.45		****
							0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****			****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students $39\ 0\ 0\ 2\ 1\ 0\ 3.33$ ****/ $29\ ****$ **** $4.34\ 4.22$ ****	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 52 Fall 2006

Page 264 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum.			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	С	14	General		Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	3						

University of Maryland

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County

Instructor:

Title

LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)

2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

Self Paced

4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations

3. Was the instructor available for consultation

Fall 2006

Page 265 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.81

0 2.67 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30

1 3.75 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.17

2.33 ****/ 42

0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** ****

0 3.33 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 4.00 ****

0 2.33 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 ****

0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****

0 3.33 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ****

**** 3.20 4.31 4.08

4.45 4.26

Enrollment: Questionnaires:	52 42 Student Co	ourse	Eval	uati	on Ç	uest	ionn	naire	è						
				Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain	new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	6	12	12	6	3.14	1583/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14
2. Did the instr	uctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	11	14	2	2.88	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.88
3. Did the exam	questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	5	10	7	14	2	2.95	1372/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.95
4. Did other eva	luations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	2	8	11	2	3.27	1470/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.27
5. Did assigned	readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	4	10	14	5	3.21	1383/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.21
6. Did written a	ssignments contribute to what you learned	d 2	20	3	3	6	7	1	3.00	1410/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the gradi	ng system clearly explained	2	0	2	12	8	11	7	3.22	1501/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.22
O TT +		2	2	0	1	^	1	2 -	4 00	721/1660	4 00	4 01	1 (7	1 ()	4 00

5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	4	10	14	5	3.21	1383/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	3	6	7	1	3.00	1410/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	12	8	11	7	3.22	1501/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	1	0	1	35	4.89	731/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	884/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.66	
Lecture		_													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	1	2	4	11		974/1514				4.32	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	3	3	12		1193/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	4	8			1005/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	3	7	6		1184/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	4	0	3	1	6	3	3.69	825/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	7	13	10	3.49	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.49	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	15	14	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	14	10	10	3.51	1274/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	5	7	10	14	3.69	677/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.69	
T . 1															
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	1	1	2	2	0	2 02	****/ 226	****	4.02	4 00	2 00	****	
<u> </u>	36	0	0	0	2 4	2	0		****/ 233	****	4.02	4.20 4.19	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	-	1	0	3	1	0		****/ 233	****			4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	_	-	<i>3</i> 5	0	Τ		, -		4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	_	0	0		****/ 223	****		4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	1	Τ	3.60	****/ 206	***	3.87	4.15	4.01	***	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
		-	-	_	_	-	-								

39

39

39

38

39

39

39

0 0 0 2 1

0

0

0

1 0

3 0

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 42

Page 265 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	С	14	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	3						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 17

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 266 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General	 I															
1. Di	.d vou	gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	2	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1525/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.40
	_	_	tor make clear			2	0	1	3	4	6	1		1548/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.20
			estions reflect	_	_	2	8	1	1	2	2	1		1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14
		_	ations reflect			2	3	1	1	4	5	1		1448/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.33
					hat you learned	2	2	0	1	4	3	5	3.92		3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92
6. Di	d writ	ten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1260/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50
7. Wa	s the	grading	system clearly	z explai	ned	2	0	1	2	6	2	4	3.40	1440/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40
8. Ho	w many	y times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.93
9. Ho	w wou	ld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	1325/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.79
			Lecture	9															
1. We	ere the	e instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	2	0	1	1	1	9	3	3.80	1307/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.90
2. Di	d the	instruc	tor seem intere	ested ir	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	788/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.33
					plained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	3	5		1277/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.69
			s contribute to	_		2	0	2	1	5	5	2		1374/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.20
5. Di	.d aud:	iovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	3	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	861/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64
			Discus																
					hat you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	****
					l to participate	14	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	****
3. Di	d the	instruc	tor encourage	fair and	l open discussion	14	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	***
			Laborat	-															
			rease understa	_		3	1	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	196/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.46
	_	_	_	_	round information	3	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	162/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.93
					or lab activities	3	0	0	0	4	5		4.07	181/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.07
			tructor provide			3	1	1	0	2	4		4.08	161/ 223		4.14		4.19	
5. We	ere re	quiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	3	2	2	0	5	1	4	3.42	176/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.42
			Semina	=							_								
2. Wa	s the	instruc	tor available i	or indi	vidual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
			Field V																
1. Di	.d fie	ld exper	ience contribut	te to wh	nat you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
			Self I																
					hat you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
3. We	ere you	ır conta	cts with the in	nstructo	or helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
							Dist	ribu	utior	ı									
Credi	ts Ear	rned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	1		
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3															0	 Ma∹-		0
28-5		2	1.00-1.99	0	A 3 B 5		кес	1urre	=u 10	or Ma	Jors	5	1	Graduat	E	U	Majo) <u>T</u>	U
	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 3						Cor	neral	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
84-1		2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Ger	ıcıaı	_				J	onder -g	Luu I	- /	INOII-	ilia JOI	Δ/
Grad		0	F 0		El-	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### -	Means +	here a	re not	enoud	rh		
51 44		•	3.50-4.00	3	P 0								_	respons				_	
					I O		Oth	ıer				1	1		~				
I 0 Other									_										

3

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title

Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

21

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 267 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							E-20	0 00011 01	nai 0			Tnat	+ m11 a + om	Courage	Dont	TIMDO	Torrol	Sect
		Ouestion	c		MD	NA	1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	Mean		Mean
		Quescion																Mean
		Genera	_															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1525/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.40
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	1	3	4	6	1	3.20	1548/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.20
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	2	8	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	3	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1448/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.33
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	2	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	905/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1260/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	0	1	2	6	2	4	3.40	1440/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.93
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	918/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.79
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	10	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1199/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.90
		ctor seem inter			10	0	0	1	1	3	2		1452/1551		4.36	4.66	4.55	4.33
				explained clearly	10	0	0	0	4	1			1255/1503		3.91			3.69
		es contribute t		-	10	0	0	2	3	1			1392/1506					
				our understanding	11	3	0	0	2	0			****/1311					3.64
		-	_	,														
		Discus					_		_		_							
				what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1490		3.53	4.05	3.85	****
				ed to participate	14	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/1502		3.84	4.26	4.06	****
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	14	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab in	crease understa	nding o	of the material	3	1	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	196/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.46
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	3	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	162/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.93
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	181/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.07
4. Did th	e lab in	structor provid	e assis	stance	3	1	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	161/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	4.08
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	3	2	2	0	5	1	4	3.42	176/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.42
		Semina	r															
2. Was th	ne instru	ctor available	for ind	dividual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	.eld expe			what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
		Self	Daced															
1. Did se	lf-paced			what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned Were your contacts with the instructor helpful				16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46		****	4.45	4.26	****
	F						trib	utio:	n									
G													_				24	
credits E	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							ке:	asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5																	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-150																		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				2	3						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0201 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 268

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 21 Ouestionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 1 4 1 3.17 1581/1669 3.22 3.81 4.23 4.02 3.17 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 1 0 5 4 2 3.50 1466/1666 3.26 3.72 4.19 4.11 3.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 5 1 1 2 2 1 3.14 1339/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3.14 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 3 0 0 6 2 1 3.44 1403/1617 3.19 3.45 4.15 3.99 3.44 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 2 5 3 3.67 1133/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.67 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2 2 0 5 2 1 3.00 1410/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 1 4 3 3 3.50 1393/1647 3.10 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.62 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1 0 4 4 0 3.22 1464/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 2.86 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 1 1 3 4 2 3.45 1398/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 3.45 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 1231/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 2 0 4 4 1 3.18 1404/1503 3.48 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.18 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 1 3 4 2 3.25 1376/1506 3.20 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 1 1 2 4 2 3.50 939/1311 3.35 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 1395/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 2.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 2 1 3.20 1376/1502 3.57 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.20 9 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.37 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.80 9 3 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1006 2.91 3.68 4.00 3.81 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 0 4 1 2 3.36 202/ 226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 3.36 4 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0 1 7 3 4.18 123/ 233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 4.18 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 1 2 4 4 4.00 187/ 225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.42 4.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 2 2 4 1 3.00 214/ 223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 3.00 2 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 1 2 5 3 3.91 138/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3.91

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0201 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 269 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls from	this course	2	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1581/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.17
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	2	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	1466/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	2	5	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	2	3	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1403/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1133/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.67
				what you learned	2	2	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1410/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
		g system clearly		ned	2	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1393/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.50
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	1	3	6	0	0	2.50	1561/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	2.86
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	prepared	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.45
		ctor seem inter			13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.45
				plained clearly	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.18
		es contribute to			13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.25
			_															
1 Did al:	ace dica	Discus		what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	2	0	2 80	1395/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.80
				to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	1		1376/1502		3.84	4.26	4.06	3.20
				d open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	2		1168/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.80
		echniques succe		open discussion	9	3	1	0	0	0	1		****/1006		3.68	4.00	3.81	****
		T - 1																
1 52 -1	. 1 . 1	Labora	-		2	0	0	4	-1	4	_	2 26	202/ 226	2 20	4 00	4 00	2 00	2 26
		crease understa			3	0	0	4	1	4	2	3.36	202/ 226		4.02	4.20	3.98	3.36
				ground information	3	0	0	0 1	1 2	7 4	3	4.18	123/ 233		4.08	4.19	4.09	4.18
				or lab activities	3	0	2	2	2	4	1	4.00	187/ 225 214/ 223	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.00
		structor providents for lab rep			3	0	0	1	2	5			, -	3.68	4.14 3.87	4.35	4.19	3.00
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	3	U	U	1	2	5	3	3.91	138/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.91
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 1				 ed f	or Ma	 ior		1	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		1/6/	darr.	cu I	J⊥ 1*10	יוטני	D	_	Graduat	_	J	Ma JC	, <u>+</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	Б / С 4		Cer	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		Gel	LLCI a.	-				5	onder -g.	Luu I		14011_	, ОТ	TI
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	O	3.30 1.00	J	P 0		11.11	CCCI	v CD				J	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	her				1	.2	T CBPOHB		c bigi	ıııcaı		
				? 1		OLI	TICI					. 4						
				; т														

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0301 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quescionne	2	•		Brudent Cot	TDC	пуат	au CI C)II Q(ACD LI	OIIII	u _T r C							
							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did voi	ı gəin ne	w insights,skil		m this course	0	0	5	3	7	5	Λ	2 60	1636/1669	3 22	2 Q1	4 23	4 02	2 60
		tor make clear			0		5	3	5	6			1615/1666		3.72			
		estions reflect			0		5	5		3			1417/1421					
	_	ations reflect			0	1	4	5	6				1586/1617					
				what you learned	1	_	3						1488/1555					
				o what you learned	2	_	4	1		3			1468/1543			4.06		
		system clearly		-	1	_	5	4	-	-			1567/1647					
		was class cance		inca	1	•	0	0	0				428/1668					
				hing effectiveness	3	-	-	4	2	3			1568/1605					
	7				_	_	-	_	_	_	_							
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures		1			4	6	1			1490/1514				4.32		
		tor seem intere		2		1	3	0	7			1446/1551				4.55		
		_	xplained clearly	2			7		5			1475/1503						
		s contribute to		2		7	4					1484/1506						
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	2	1	6	2	1	4	4	2.88	1165/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.07
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ate to	what you learned	5	0	9	1	2	3	0	1.93	1476/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	1.93
				d to participate	5	0	4	3	3	4			1463/1502				4.06	2.67
3. Did the	instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	4	3	3	4	0	2.50	1468/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.50
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful	-	5	5	4	1	2	3	0	2.40	990/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	2.40
		- ,																
1 1 - 1		Laborat		5 . 1		0	2				-	0 55	004/ 006	2 20	4 00	4 00	2 00	0 55
		rease understar			4		3	4	4	4		2.75	,		4.02		3.98	
				ground information	4		3 2		7			2.81			4.08	4.19		2.81
				or lab activities	4	-							214/ 225		4.35			
		tructor provide			4	0 2	2	2	4 6	4 1		3.38						
5. were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts ci	early specified	4	2	2	3	ь	Τ	2	2.86	197/ 206	3.40	3.8/	4.15	4.01	2.86
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ation	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	A 1 B 8		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2		Ger	neral					0	Under-q	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	19	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 3	D 0									5				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ιh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Oth	ner					9			5			
			- 0															

0

Page 270

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0301 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: MENDEX, MIGUEL (Instr. B) Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 20

Page 271 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestionnair	

			Fre	aner	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	7	5	0		1636/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	5	6	1		1615/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	5	5	2	3	0		1417/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	6	3	1		1586/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	4	5	4	1		1488/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	2.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	6	3	2		1468/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	4	5	2	3		1567/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	8	1	3.64	1286/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1457/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	2.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	3	1	4	1		1509/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	2	4	2	1		1398/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	3	3	2	1		1396/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	3	2	1	2		1057/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.07
Discussion	_	_		_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	1	2	3	0		1476/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	1.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	3	3	4	1		1463/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	3	4	0		1468/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	4	1	2	3	0	2.40	990/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	2.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	4	4	4	1	2.75	224/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	2.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	3	2	7	3	1	2.81	224/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	2.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	214/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	3.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	207/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	2	3	6	1	2	2.86	197/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.86
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
	_													

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-		-	
				2	Λ						

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: Enrollment:

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

12 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 272 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	COLLEGE	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies	s 4	5		cructor		_		Level	
Questions	NR	INA						Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1520/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1387/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1222/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	6	0	3.56	1353/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1062/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	0	6	0	3.20	1358/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1435/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	918/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	6		1082/1514			4.39	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	7		1193/1551		4.36	4.66	4.55	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2			1025/1503		3.91		4.17	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3			1243/1506		3.80	4.26	4.17	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	U	2	4	3	2	3.45	967/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1447/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	1		1357/1502		3.84	4.26	4.06	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	2	0	1		1434/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	1	1	0		923/1006			4.00		3.00
		_		_	_	_	-		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	174/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	139/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.09
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	153/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	189/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	158/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	***	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
Frequ	iency	r Diet	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment:

KHATRI, RAJU

12 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 273 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

2. Did the instr 3. Did the exam	Questions 		NR	NA	1	2	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	ructo: Rai	_	Course Mean	Mean	Mean	Level	Sec
2. Did the instr 3. Did the exam	 General																ME
2. Did the instr 3. Did the exam																	
. Did the instr		s course	0	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1520/3	1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.
. Did the exam	- ·		0	0	0	1	4	5	2		1387/		3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.
	_	-	0	4	0	1	3	3			1222/1		2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.
· Did Office Eve			0	3	0	1	2	6			1353/		3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.
	<u>-</u>	_	0	0	0	1	4	4							4.15	3.99	
_	_	-			0		0				1062/		3.53	3.79			
		it you rearned	0	2	-	4	-	6	0		1358/		3.19	3.48		3.86	3.
			0	0	1	1	5	2			1435/		3.10	3.70		4.06	3.
-		66	0	0	0	0	0			5.00		1668		4.91	4.67		5.
. How would you	a grade the overall teaching	effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	3	Τ	3.38	1412/	1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.
	Lecture																
. Were the inst	tructor's lectures well prepa	ired	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1199/	1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.
. Did the instr	ructor seem interested in the	subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1467/	1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.
. Was lecture m	naterial presented and explai	ned clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1210/	1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.
. Did the lectu	ures contribute to what you l	.earned	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1243/3	1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.
	_		8	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	939/	1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.
	Discussion																
Did class dis		vou learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	0	2 40	1447/3	1490	2 81	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.
			6	0	1	0	2	2	-		1357/		3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.
			7	0	1	1	2	0	_		1434/		3.37		4.29	4.07	
	-	ii discussion	7	2	0	1	1	1	0		923/					3.81	
	-										,						
			_	_				_									_
	_		1	0	0	2	1	6			174/		3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.
			1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	139/		3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.
	=		1	0	0	0	1	6			153/		4.08		4.50		4.
	-		1	0	0	3	1	3			189/		3.68	4.14	4.35		3.
. Were requirem	ments for lab reports clearly	specified	1	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	158/	206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.
	Seminar																
. Were assigned	d topics relevant to the anno	unced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	112	****	****	4.38	4.04	* *
. Was the instr	ructor available for individu	al attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	97	****	****	4.36	4.19	* *
. Did research	projects contribute to what	vou learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	92	****	****	4.22	3.79	* *
		-	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	105	****	****	4.20	3.94	* *
			11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/	98	***	****	3.95	3.90	* *
	Field Work																
. Did field exp		ou learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	* *
		Frequ	onat	, Diat	-rib	ution											
		rrequ	lency	DISC		ucioi	1										
redits Earned		pected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	5
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0	А б		Rec	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Grad	duate	e	0	Majo	or	
28-55 7	1.00-1.99 0	В 4															
	2.00-2.99 0	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	
56-83 2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0															
84-150 0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	ves				0	###	# - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	jh
84-150 0	instructor's lectures well prepared instructor seem interested in the subject re material presented and explained clearly ectures contribute to what you learned visual techniques enhance your understanding. Discussion discussions contribute to what you learned students actively encouraged to participate instructor encourage fair and open discussicated in techniques successful Laboratory ab increase understanding of the material provided with adequate background informations are understanding of the material provided with adequate background informations are instructor provide assistance irements for lab reports clearly specified. Seminar gned topics relevant to the announced them instructor available for individual attentions contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear Field Work experience contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear Field Work experience contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear Field Work experience contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear Field Work experience contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear Field Work experience contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear Field Work experience contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear Field Work experience contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear Field Work experience contribute to what you learned eria for grading made clear			Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means tes to b			_	gh

? 0

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0501 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 274 JAN 18, 2007

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Frequencies

Questions

Rank

Rank

Mean

Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 2 5 8 1 3.35 1415/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 3.29

- •	were the instructor b rectares werr prepared		0	_			0	_	3.33 1113/1311	3.01	1.10	1.00	1.52	5.25
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88 1448/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.48
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	4	6	1	3.13 1413/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	2.99
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	4	5	2	2	2.75 1436/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.54
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	1	0	6	4	3.33 1027/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.10

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75 ****/	1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00 ****/	1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50 ****/	1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50 ****/	1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****

T abanahana														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	2	3	1	3	2.92	221/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	2.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	4	0	2	5	1	2.92	222/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	2.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	209/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	5	1	2	2	2	2.58	218/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	2.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	4	0	5	1	1	2.55	201/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.55

Self Paced

 $1. \ \, \text{Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned} \qquad 17 \qquad 0 \qquad 0 \qquad 0 \qquad 0 \qquad 0 \qquad 2 \quad 5.00 \ ^{****}/ \ \ 55 \quad 3.40 \quad 3.40 \quad 4.34 \quad 4.17 \quad ^{****}$

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				2	1						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0501 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23
Ouestionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 275

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 5 3 8 2 1 2.53 1645/1669 3.22 3.81 4.23 4.02 2.53 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 3 7 5 4 0 2.53 1635/1666 3.26 3.72 4.19 4.11 2.53 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 6 5 2 2 1 2 2.42 1412/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 2.42 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 4 2 3 3 3 2.93 1541/1617 3.19 3.45 4.15 3.99 2.93 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 5 1 3 4 5 3.17 1395/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.17 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5 5 1 3 2 2 2.62 1501/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 2.62 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 6 3 4 4 1 2.50 1586/1647 3.10 3.70 4.12 4.06 2.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 19 5.00 1/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.62 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 8 3 2 1 0 1.71 1598/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 2.36 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 6 0 3 1 2 4 3 3.23 1433/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 3.29 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 4 0 3 3 3.08 1522/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 3.48 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 4 1 3 3 2 2.85 1443/1503 3.48 3.91 4.24 4.17 2.99 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 5 3 1 1 2 2.33 1476/1506 3.20 3.80 4.26 4.17 2.54 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 5 2 2 0 1 2 2.86 1173/1311 3.35 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.10 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 1 1 0 2 0 2.75 ****/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 **** 15 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 1 3.00 ****/1502 3.57 3.84 4.26 4.06 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 1 1 1 0 2.50 ****/1489 3.37 3.59 4.29 4.07 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 15 0 1 1 1 1 0 2.50 ****/1006 2.91 3.68 4.00 3.81 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 3 2 3 1 3 2.92 221/226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 2.92 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 4 0 2 5 1 2.92 222/233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 2.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 2 0 2 3 5 3.75 209/225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.42 3.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 5 1 2 2 2 2.58 218/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 2.58 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7 1 4 0 5 1 1 2.55 201/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 2.55 Self Paced

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				2	1						

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 20

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 276 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

								_	ncies	3		Inst	tructo	or	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	ınk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 																
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	4	6	6	4	3.50	1480/	1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	7	6	3		1523/			3.72	4.19	4.11	3.35
		uestions reflect			0	6	2	1	1	8	2	3.50	1222/	1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	6	5	4	4		1455/		3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.32
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	8	5	3.79	1037/	1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.79
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	7	2	3.47	1272/	1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.47
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly	expla:	ined	1	0	0	5	6	4	4	3.37	1459/	1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94			4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94
9. How w	ould you	grade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	3	4	8	2	1	2.67	1549/	1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.53
		Lecture	è																
		uctor's lectures	_		0	0	1	5	5	7	2	3.20	1438/	1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.80
		ctor seem intere		_	0	0	1	1	1	6	11		1338/		4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.22
				xplained clearly	0	0	3	3	5	7	2		1417/		3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.60
		es contribute to	_		0	0	7	4	4	4	1		1470/			3.80	4.26		
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	2	2	2	2	4	6	2	3.25	1057/	1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.46
		Discuss																	
				what you learned	14	0	4	0	1	1	0	1.83				3.53	4.05	3.85	1.83
				d to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2		4.20		1502		3.84	4.26	4.06	4.20
				d open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	1		1038/		3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.00
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	sstul		16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****
		Laborat	_				_			_			400						
		crease understar	_		3	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53		226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.53
		_		ground information	3	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	158/		3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.94
	_			or lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41		225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.41
		structor provide			3	0	0	1 2	1 2	5 8	10 5	4.41	128/	223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19 4.01	4.41
5. were	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cie	early specified	3	U	U	2	۷	Ö	5	3.94	129/	206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.94
		Field W	Vork																
		rience contribut			19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did y	ou clearly	y understand you	ır evalı	uation criteria	17	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/	52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
		Self E	Paced																
				what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/		3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
		tions make clear		_	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/		3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	****
	_	acts with the ir		_	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/		****	****	4.45	4.26	****
		ck/tutoring by p		_	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	55	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were	there enou	ugh proctors for	all th	ne students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5				Туј	рe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	1	Gra	duat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В 9					10	,,,,		•	010		-	•	- 100) 0	•	ŭ
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 5		Ger	nera:	1				0	Und	ler-g	rad 2	20	Non-	major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	###	# - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	gh
				P 0									res	ponse	es to b	oe sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.8							
				າ 1															

?

1

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 21

GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 277 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General d you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 6 6 4 3.50 1480/1669 3.22 3.51 4.23 4.02 3 d the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 3 7 6 3 3.35 1523/1666 3.26 3.72 4.19 4.11 3 d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 2 1 1 8 2 3.50 1222/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 6 2 1 1 8 2 3.50 1222/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.70 1222/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.70 1222/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d assigned readings asystem clearly explained 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.71 1272/1549 3.33 3.74 4.00 3.99 3 d set of grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.37 1272/1549 3.33 3.75 4.00 3.99 3 w many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.37 1272/1549 3.33 3.76 4.03 3.99 3 w many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.37 1272/1549 3.33 3.76 4.00 3.99 3 w many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.37 1272/1549 3.33 3.76 4.00 3.99 3 w many times was class explained effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 d the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 955/1514 3.64 4.13 4.67 4.62 4 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18								_	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Se
d you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 6 6 4 3.50 1480/1698 3.22 3.81 4.23 4.02 3 d the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 6 2 1 1 8 2 3.50 1282/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 2 1 1 8 2 3.50 1222/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 6 5 4 4 3.27 1458/1647 3.19 3.45 4.15 3.99 3 d assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.79 1037/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3 s the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 1 4 8 5 3.79 1037/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3 s the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.27 1458/1669 3.20 3.04 4.12 4.05 3 s the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 752/1609 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 s the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 752/1609 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 s the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 752/1609 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 s the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 6 4.40 955/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.5			Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Me
d you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 6 6 4 3.50 1480/1698 3.22 3.81 4.23 4.02 3 d the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 6 2 1 1 8 2 3.50 1282/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 2 1 1 8 2 3.50 1222/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 6 5 4 4 3.27 1458/1647 3.19 3.45 4.15 3.99 3 d assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.79 1037/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3 s the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 1 4 8 5 3.79 1037/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3 s the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.27 1458/1669 3.20 3.04 4.12 4.05 3 s the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 752/1609 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 s the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 752/1609 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 s the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 752/1609 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 s the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 6 4.40 955/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.52 4.5			General															
d the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 3 7 6 3 3.35 1523/166 3.26 3.72 4.19 4.11 3 d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 2 1 1 8 2 3.50 1222/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 d other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 6 5 4 4 3.32 1455/147 3.19 3.45 4.15 3.99 4.3 d assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.79 1037/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3 d written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.79 1037/1555 3.30 3.79 4.00 3.80 3 we many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.37 1472/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 3 we many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.94 422/1668 3.26 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 we many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 955/1514 3.64 4.13 4.29 4.65 4.66 4.55 4.66 4.66	. Did you	gain ne		rom this course	0	0	0	4	6	6	4	3.50	1480/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.
d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 2 1 1 8 2 3.50 1222/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3 do drote revaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 6 5 4 4 3.37 1525/1617 3.19 3.45 4.15 3.99 3 dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.79 1037/1525 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3 dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 1 6 7 2 3.47 1272/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 3 s the grading system clearly explained 1 2 1 1 6 7 2 3.47 1272/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 3 s the grading system clearly explained 1 2 0 1 1 6 4.94 428/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.62 4 w would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 wrs. tha instructor's lecture well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 6 4 4 2.0161/1551 4.06 4.91 4.07 3.96 3 4 the instructor's lecture well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4 4 4.00 158/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4 6 10 to the teaching presented and explained clearly 10 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4 4 1.00 1015/1503 3.48 4.06 4.55 4 6 10 toture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 0 1 1 1 4 4 4 1.00 1015/1503 3.48 4.01 4.17 4 4.17 4 6 10 the teaching december of the teaching december	_				0	0	1	3	7	6	3	3.35	1523/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.
d assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 4 8 5 3.79 1037/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3 do written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 1 6 7 2 3.47 1272/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 3 st be grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.37 1459/1647 3.10 3.70 4.12 4.06 3 st be grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.37 1459/1647 3.10 3.70 4.12 4.06 3 st be grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 16 4 3.37 1459/1647 3.10 3.70 4.12 4.06 3 st be grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 1 16 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4 6 4.40 955/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 3 d the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 4 4.20 1301/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4 4 1 4 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					0	6	2	1	1	8	2	3.50	1222/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.
d written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 1 6 7 2 3.47 1272/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 3 with the production system clearly explained 1 0 0 5 6 4 4 3.37 1272/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 3 with the production of the p	. Did oth	er evalı	uations reflect the e	expected goals	0	1	0	6	5	4	4	3.32	1455/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3
#### State grading system clearly explained whose provided states are special teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 4.391 4.94 4.94 4.67 4.62 4 who would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 4.881/668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.62 4 who would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Did ass	igned re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	8	5	3.79	1037/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3
Wampy times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 16 4.94 428/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.62 4 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 525/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3 would you grade the fortune of the subject 10 0 0 0 2 2 4 4 4.20 1361/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4 18 lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 0 1 1 2 2 4 4 1.0 1015/1503 3.48 3.91 4.24 4.17 3 d additional techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 0 3 2 1 3.67 846/1311 3.35 3.57 3.85 3.68 3 Discussion Contribute to what you learned 14 0 4 0 1 1 0 1.83 1480/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 1 are all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 0 0 1 2 2 4 1.00 920/1502 3.57 3.84 4.06 4.06 4 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/1006 2.91 3.68 4.00 3.81 ** Laboratory d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 190/ 226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 3 we you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.88 4.00 3.81 ** renecessing materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 4 d to you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 55 3.40 3.80 4.22 4.00 ** do you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 2 0 0 0 1 5 0.00 ***/ 55 3.40 3.80 4.22 4.00 ** do you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Did wri	tten as	signments contribute	to what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	7	2	3.47	1272/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3
Lecture Lect	Was the	grading	g system clearly exp	lained	1	0	0	5	6	4	4	3.37	1459/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3
Lecture Tend the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40 955/1514 2.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 3 4.50 4.55	How man	y times	was class cancelled		3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4
re the instructor's lectures well prepared	How wou	ld you	grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	525/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3
d the instructor seem interested in the subject 10 0 0 0 2 2 4 4 4.20 1361/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4 is lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.10 1015/1503 3.48 3.91 4.24 4.17 3 d the lectures contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 1 2 2 4 3.70 1262/1506 3.20 3.80 4.26 4.17 3 d addivisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 3 2 1 3.67 846/1311 3.35 3.57 3.85 3.68 3 Discussion contribute to what you learned 14 0 4 0 1 1 0 1.83 1480/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 1 are all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 920/1502 3.57 3.84 4.26 4.06 4 d the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/1006 2.91 3.68 4.00 3.81 ** Laboratory d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.55 190/226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.81 ** d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 190/226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.81 ** d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 158/233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 3 ree necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 137/225 4.08 4.35 4.15 4.01 3 ree requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3 rerequirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 4 rerequirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Lecture															
Selecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 0 1 1 4 4 4 .10 1015/1503 3.48 3.91 4.24 4.17 3 d the lectures contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 1 2 2 4 3.70 1262/1506 3.20 3.80 4.26 4.17 3 d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 0 3 2 1 3.67 846/1311 3.35 3.57 3.85 3.68 3	Were th	e instr	uctor's lectures well	l prepared	10	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	955/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3
d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 4 0 1 1 0 0.83 1480/1490 2.81 3.53 3.53 3.68 3 Tre all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 4.00 920/1502 3.57 3.84 4.26 4.06 4 d the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 0 1 1 2 0 0.00 1.03 1480/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 1 Laboratory d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 190/226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.88 3 Tre you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 158/233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 4 d the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.11 137/225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.12 4 d the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.11 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 4 dre requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.11 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 4 d you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 * Self Paced d self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 * d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 58 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 * d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 58 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 * d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Did the	instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1361/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4
d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 3 2 1 3.07 1262/1506 3.20 3.80 4.26 4.17 3 d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 5 0 0 3 2 1 3.67 846/1311 3.35 3.57 3.85 3.68 3 Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 4 0 1 1 0 1.83 1480/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.68 3 Tree all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 4.02 920/1502 3.57 3.84 4.26 4.06 4 d the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 0 1 1 3 1 4.00 1038/1489 3.37 3.59 4.29 4.07 4 Tree special techniques successful 16 2 0 0 1 1 1 0 3.50 ****/1006 2.91 3.68 4.00 3.81 ** Laboratory d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 190/ 226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 3 Tree your provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 158/ 233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 4 Tree necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 158/ 233 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 4 Tree requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3 The requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3 The requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3 The requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3 The requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3 The requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Was lec	ture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1015/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3
Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 4 0 1 1 0 1.83 1480/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					10	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1262/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3
d class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 4 0 1 1 0 1.83 1480/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 1	Did aud	iovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	9	5	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	846/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3
re all students actively encouraged to participate			Discussion															
the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 1038/1489 3.37 3.59 4.29 4.07 are special techniques successful 16 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 *****/1006 2.91 3.68 4.00 3.81 are you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 158/233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 are necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 137/225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.42 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 1 5 50 4.41 128/23 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 1 5 50 4.41 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 1 5 50 4.41 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 d.	Did cla	ss disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	14	0	4	0	1	1	0	1.83	1480/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	
Laboratory d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.50 ****/1006 2.91 3.68 4.00 3.81 and the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 190/ 226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 and the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 190/ 226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 and the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 158/ 233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 are necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 137/ 225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.42 and the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 128/ 223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.80 4.22 4.00 dyou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.03 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 are specified 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 disturbed by a study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Were al	l stude	nts actively encoura	ged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	920/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	
Laboratory d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 190/226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 incre you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 158/233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 incre necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 137/225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.42 defined the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 defined requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 increase in the requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 increase in the requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 increase in the requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 increase in the requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 increase in the requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Did the	instru	ctor encourage fair a	and open discussion	15	0		0		3	1	4.00	1038/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	4
d the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 2 4 7 3 3.53 190/ 226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 ire you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 158/ 233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 ire necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 137/ 225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.42 details instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 128/ 223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 details requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 10 details requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 10 details requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 10 details requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.80 4.22 4.00 details requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.80 4.11 4.08 details requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 0 1 1.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 details requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 details report specified 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 details report specified 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 details report specified 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.30 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 details report specified 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 details report specified 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Were sp	ecial te	echniques successful		16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	•
re you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 3 8 5 3.94 158/233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			_															
re necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 137/ 225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.42 4 d the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 128/ 223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 4 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/ 206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3 Field Work d field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 ** d you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 ** Self Paced d self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 ** d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 ** as the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 ** as the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 *** **** 4.45 4.26 ** are there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ** Frequency Distribution tts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution tts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 10 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major Frequency Distribution tts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 10 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 9 9 0 Major 11 0 0 0.00-0.99 0 Major 12 0 0.00-0.99 0 Major 13 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5 General 0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 9 0 Major 15 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 0 Major 15 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 0 Major 16 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 0 Major 17 0 0 0.00-0.99 0 Major 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						-					_							
d the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 1 1 5 10 4.41 128/223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 are requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 2 2 8 5 3.94 129/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 3 Field Work d field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 Self Paced d self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.1	_	_	_	_														
Field Work d field experience contribute to what you learned		_					-						- ,					
Field Work d field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 * d you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 * Self Paced d self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 * d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 * ire your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * is the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 * ire there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 * Frequency Distribution tts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution tts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 10 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 11 Graduate 0 Major 12 Graduate 0 Major 13 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5 General 0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 14 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 15 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 16 1 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			_															
d field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 ** d you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 ** Self Paced d self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 ** d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 ** tre your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 ** tre there enough proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ** Frequency Distribution tts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution tts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Type Majors To 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 10 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 9 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Were re	quireme	nts for lab reports o	clearly specified	3	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	129/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3
Self Paced d self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 * d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 * fore your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * fore there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.25 4.25 * Frequency Distribution tts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Type Majors Type Majors General 0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 50 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 L. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant										_								
Self Paced d self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 * d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 * dre your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 29 **** **** 4.25 4.25 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 20 **** 4.50 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 20 **** 4.25 4.25 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 20 **** 4.25 4.25 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 20 **** 4.25 4.25 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 20 **** 4.25 4.25 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 30 **** 4.25 4.25 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 30 **** 4.25 4.25 * districted by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 30 **** 4.25 * districte		_		_						-	-		,					
d self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 * d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 * the your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 * the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 * the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 * Frequency Distribution ts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Type Majors To 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 10 0 0.01-1.99 0 B 9 10 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5 10 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 11 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	Did you	clearly	y understand your eva	aluation criteria	17	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	,
d study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 for eyour contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 for the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 19 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for either enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 for enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 20 8											_							
### - Means there are not enough process to be significant 19		_	-	_														
the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 19 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ** Frequency Distribution The Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Type Majors				_			-			-	-		, 12					
Frequency Distribution Type Majors Type Majors To 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major To 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 To 2.00-2.99 2 C 5 General 0 Under-grad 20 Non-major To 1.00-3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough processors to be significant	_			_									,					
Frequency Distribution Its Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 17 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Majors 18 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 18 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5 General 0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 18 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 18 1 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				_						-	-		,					
ts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 7 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 8 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 8 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5 General 0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 8 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 8 1 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	.010 0110	agn proceeds for all					_	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 23			1.01	1.22	
27					rency	DIS	CLID	ucio	11									
7 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 23 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5 General 0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 25 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 26 1 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	edits Ea 	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5 			Ту	ре 			Majors 	3
23 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 5 General 0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 250 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 21. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough 250 P 0 responses to be significant	0-27	-				Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	
1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0	8-55					~		7				0	TT3			NT		
I. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant	6-83					Ge	nera	Т				U	unaer-g	rad 2	U	Non-	-major	
P 0 responses to be significant	4-150			- •								0	шшпп	M	la a se s			1-
	rad.	U	3.50-4.00 3			Ele	ecti	ves				U					_	дn
1 U Other 18			Lecture Instructor's lectures well prepared instructor's lectures well prepared instructor's lectures well prepared instructor seem interested in the subject rematerial presented and explained clearly extures contribute to what you learned risual techniques enhance your understanding insulation in the subject rematerial presented and explained clearly extures contribute to what you learned risual techniques enhance your understanding discussions contribute to what you learned extructor encourage fair and open discussions. In the subject is all techniques successful Laboratory in the material extructor encourage fair and open discussions and techniques successful Laboratory in the increase understanding of the material extractor provide assistance in the instructor provide assistance in the instructor contribute to what you learned extracted where it is a self in the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted with the instructor helpful extracted in the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the students in the students of the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the students of the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the students of the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the students of the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the students of the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the students of the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the students of the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the students of the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the expected goal contacts with the instructor helpful extracted in the expected goal contacts with th	- *		۵.,	1				_	0	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1 C	
						Ot.	ner				1	. o						

1

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

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

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 278 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	4	5		1525/1669		3.81	4.23	4.02	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	6	2	5		1574/1666		3.72	4.19	4.11	3.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	4	4	3	2		1395/1421		3.49	4.24	4.11	2.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	6	2	4	2			1582/1617		3.45		3.99	2.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	1	5	3	4		1427/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	2	2	4	3		1410/1543		3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	5	4	4	1		1580/1647		3.70	4.12	4.06	2.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	17		926/1668		4.91	4.67	4.62	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	5	0	5	3	3	2.94	1518/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	1	5	4	4	3.17	1442/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	5	4	9		1397/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	1	4	4	-		1453/1503		3.91		4.17	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	5	0	6		1413/1506			4.26	4.17	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	5	1	4	3			1167/1311					2.76
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1265/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1301/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1191/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	902/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	4	4	4	3 64	182/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	2	6	3	2	3.21	216/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36		4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	178/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	3	0	3	6	1		185/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52		4.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	***	****	4.45	4.26	****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 278 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: 22

KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B) Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 279 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	20	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies Instr			tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	4	5	3.40	1525/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	6	2	5	3.05	1574/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	4	4	3	2	2.71	1395/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	6	2	4	2	3	2.65	1582/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	1	5	3	4	3.00	1427/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	2	2	4	3	3.00	1410/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	5	4	4	1	2.61	1580/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	926/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	737/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.58
Lecture	_			_										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	4	4	4		1337/1514			4.39	4.32	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	5	6		1381/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	3	6			1245/1503	3.48		4.24	4.17	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	5	2			1277/1506			4.26	4.17	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	1210/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	1	1	3	3 25	1265/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	0	4		1301/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	1	4		1191/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	1	1		3.17	902/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	
I Hold bycolal committant bacceptul		_	_	Ū	_	_	_	3.1.	302, 1000	2.72	3.00	1.00	3.01	J. 1
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	182/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	2	6	3	2	3.21	216/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	144/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	178/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	3	0	3	6	1	3.15	185/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.15
Seminar	1.0	0	1	0	1	^	0	2.00	4444/110	4444		4 20	4 0 4	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0 1	1 1	0	0		****/ 112 ****/ 97	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18		0		_	0	•	2.50	****/ 97 ****/ 105	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1 0	2 1	0 1	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	U	Τ	1	U	0	0	1.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 20 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 279 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0801 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 280 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies In						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1395/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	3		1455/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	1	1	3	1		1388/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1552/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	715/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1349/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	1	2	2.77	1559/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	2	5	1	3.18	1475/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	0	6	4	3.69	1343/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	2	8		1374/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	1	4	5		1297/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	2	5	2	3.08	1399/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	757/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1251/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	950/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	0	0	2	2		1398/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.63	184/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	198/ 233	3.70	4.02	4.19	4.09	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	152/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	204/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	197/ 206	3.40	3.87		4.19	2.83
J. Here requirements for tab reports creatly specified	J	_	_	_	U	4	_	2.03	101/ 200	3.10	3.07	1.13	1.01	2.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

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

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0801 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 281 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Quescionne	alles.		Beddelle Cod	iibc	LVal	uucı	O11 Q	acsc.		all							
							_	ncie	3		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skill	s from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1395/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.69
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear t	he expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1455/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.54
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the expected goals	0	4	3	1	1	3	1	2.78	1388/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.78
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect t	he expected goals	0	2	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1552/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.91
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribut	e to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	715/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.09
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contrib	oute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1349/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.23
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	explained	0	0	2	4	4	1	2	2.77	1559/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.77
8. How man	ny times	was class cancel	led	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.09
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	well prepared	1	0	3	0	2	1	6	3.58	1373/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.64
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interes	ted in the subject	1	0	3	1	0	4	4	3.42	1499/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.79
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	0	4	4	3.64	1289/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	1355/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.22
		nce your understanding	3	6	1	0	0	1			791/1311		3.57	3.85	3.68	3.78	
		Discussi	.on														
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribut	e to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1251/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively enco	ouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	950/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.14
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage fa	ir and open discussion	6	0	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1398/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques success	ful	6	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****
		Laborato	ry														
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understand	ling of the material	5	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	184/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.63
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequate	background information	5	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	198/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.63
			ble for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	152/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.29
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provide	assistance	6	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	204/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.43
5. Were re	. Did the lab instructor provide assistance . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified						1	0	2	1	2.83	197/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.83
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Crodita E	a was a d	Errogted Credes				D.o.	2222	-			т.	~~			Majaza		
Credits Ea	Expected Grades					ason:	> 			Ту 	 he			Majors	, 		
00-27							ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0 B 5		~		,					1	, ,	2			1.0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 1		Ge	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad l	.3	Non-	major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 1														

Electives

Other

0

10

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

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

Fall 2006

Page 282 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_	_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	3	4		1568/1669	3.22		4.23	4.02	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	2	5		1523/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	4	5	1	1		1407/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	5	3	4		1393/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	4	4	3		1303/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2 1	1	2	7	4			1382/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3 0	6 0	3 0		5.00	1393/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06 4.62	3.50 5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	2	4	2			1/1668 1446/1605	4.94 3.33	4.91		3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	۷	1	۷	۷	4	2	4	3.49	1446/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.90	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	4	2	7	3.53	1385/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	3	9		1384/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	2	5	4	3.53	1321/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	4	1	5	3.27	1374/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	3.00	1115/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	6	4	2		1178/1490	2.81		4.05	3.85	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	6	3		1154/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	6	3			1352/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	4	4	1	0	2.50	967/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	2.50
I above towar														
Laboratory	7	0	0	2	1	1	_	2 00	160/ 226	2 20	4 00	4 00	2 00	2 00
 Did the lab increase understanding of the material Were you provided with adequate background information 	7 7	0	0	3 0	1 4	1 1	5 5	3.80 4.10	169/ 226 139/ 233	3.38 3.70	4.02	4.20 4.19	3.98 4.09	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	1	1	3		3.80	206/ 225	4.08		4.19	4.09	4.10 3.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	3	0	5	3.80	185/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	2	3	0	-	3.40	177/ 206	3.40	3.87			3.40
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	,	U	_	2	5	U	-	3.40	1777 200	3.10	3.07	1.13	1.01	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	44/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	3.80
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	3	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	34/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	46/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	3.40
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	34/ 42	3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	3.20
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	2	1	1	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	,	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
									,					

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 17

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 282 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: Enrollment:

KATX, CIVIA (Instr. B)

23 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Page 283 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies	!		Ingi	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	3	4		1568/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	2	5		1523/1666		3.72	4.19	4.11	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	4	5	1	1		1407/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	5	3	4		1393/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	4	4	3		1303/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	7	4	1		1382/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	6	3	4		1393/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	871/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	1082/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	3	7		1304/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	959/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	1	6		1033/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	1	2	0			780/1311		3.57			3.39
J. Did additivistal techniques emiance your understanding	U	2		_	2	U	J	3.70	700/1311	3.33	3.37	3.03	3.00	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	1178/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1154/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	1352/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	4	4	1	0	2.50	967/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	169/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	139/ 233	3.70	4.02	4.19	4.09	4.10
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	206/ 225		4.35	4.19	4.42	3.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	3	0	5	3.80	185/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	2	3	0	4	3.40	177/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.35		3.40
5. Were requirements for rab reports crearry specified	,	U		2	J	U	1	3.40	1777 200	3.40	3.07	4.13	4.01	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33		****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	44/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	3.80
		0		1	0	2	2							
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12		0	1			0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	3	0		2	0	-		****/ 39			4.39	4.30	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	34/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	46/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	3.40
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	34/ 42	3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	3.20
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: KATX, CIVIA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 283 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MAR
Enrollment: 14

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Ouestionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 284

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 1 3 3 1 3.22 1570/1669 3.22 3.81 4.23 4.02 3.22 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 4 4 1 3.67 1387/1666 3.26 3.72 4.19 4.11 3.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 2 1 0 4 1 1 3.14 1339/1421 2.90 3.49 4.24 4.11 3.14 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1251/1617 3.19 3.45 4.15 3.99 3.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 4 2 2 3.75 1062/1555 3.53 3.79 4.00 3.92 3.75 3 3 2 3.88 1043/1543 3.19 3.48 4.06 3.86 3.88 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 1496/1647 3.10 3.70 4.12 4.06 3.25 0 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 901/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.62 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 2 0 0 4 1 1 3.50 1357/1605 3.33 3.76 4.07 3.96 3.75 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 2 2 0 5 3.60 1369/1514 3.64 4.13 4.39 4.32 4.02 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 0 2 0 7 4.20 1361/1551 4.06 4.36 4.66 4.55 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 2 3 1 3 3.30 1386/1503 3.48 3.91 4.24 4.17 3.71 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 1 2 1 3 3.00 1403/1506 3.20 3.80 4.26 4.17 3.39 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 2 0 3 0 5 3.60 890/1311 3.35 3.57 3.85 3.68 3.59 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 1 2 3.50 1154/1490 2.81 3.53 4.05 3.85 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 2 1 2 3.67 1253/1502 3.57 3.84 4.26 4.06 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 3 1 2 3.83 1155/1489 3.37 3.59 4.29 4.07 3.83 4. Were special techniques successful 1 3 0 2 3.50 759/1006 2.91 3.68 4.00 3.81 3.50 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 1 0 3.00 212/ 226 3.38 4.02 4.20 3.98 3.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 127/ 233 3.70 4.08 4.19 4.09 4.17 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 170/ 225 4.08 4.35 4.50 4.42 4.17 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 109/ 223 3.68 4.14 4.35 4.19 4.50 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 110/206 3.40 3.87 4.15 4.01 4.17 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0 1 5.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.04 **** 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.19 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 3.79 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 Ω 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 3.94 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** *** 3.95 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 3.80 3.80 4.22 4.00 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.06 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 9 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 4.30 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 3.00 3.00 3.97 4.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** *** 4.33 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 3.40 3.40 4.34 4.17 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 42 3.20 3.20 4.31 4.08 ****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.26 ****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 10

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 284 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 10

MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B)

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 285 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	3	1	3 22	1570/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	1		1387/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	4	1	1		1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	2		1251/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	2		1062/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	3	2		1043/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	3	1	2		1496/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80		4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	918/1605			4.07	3.96	
• 5														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	, .	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70		4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2			1005/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	4		1236/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	904/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	2 E0	1154/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4 4	0	0	1	2	1	2		1253/1502		3.84	4.05	4.06	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	2		1155/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	,		3.68	4.00		3.50
1. Were special techniques successial	-	U	U		J	U	2	3.30	739/1000	2.91	3.00	1.00	3.01	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	212/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	127/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	170/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	109/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	110/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	4.17
Seminar	_	_	_	_										
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														

Τ.	were the instructor b rectures werr prepared	_	U	U	U		_	0	1.11	0,22,13	, 1 1	5.01	1.13	1.55	1.52	1.02	
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	986/15	551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1005/15	503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.71	
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1236/15	06	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.39	
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	904/13	311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.59	
	Discussion																
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	2		1154/14					3.85	3.50	
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	2		1253/15		3.57	3.84		4.06	3.67	
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	2		1155/14		3.37			4.07	3.83	
4.	Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	759/10	006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.50	
	T all and barre																
1	Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	212/ 2	26	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.00	
	Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17			3.70	4.02	4.19	4.09	4.17	
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	0	4				4.08	4.06			4.17	
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	4					4.14		4.19	4.50	
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	110/ 2			3.87		4.19	4.17	
٥.	were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	4	U	U	U	2	1	3	4.1/	110/ 2	200	3.40	3.07	4.15	4.01	4.17	
	Seminar																
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 1	12	***	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	97	***	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	92	***	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 1	105	***	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	98	***	****	3.95	3.90	****	
	Field Work																
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
	Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1			39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***	
	Self Paced																
1	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5 00	****/	55	3.40	3 40	4.34	4 17	****	
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	42	3.20	3.20		4.08	****	
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1			46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	
٠.	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	-	ŭ	Ŭ	•	ŭ	Ü	_	2.00	,				1.51			

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14 Baltimore County

Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 285 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course Section: CHEM 123 0101

Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA

Enrollment: 99
Questionnaires: 65

Fall 2006

Page 286 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain nev	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	10	22	32	4.29	864/166	9 4.29	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.29
		tor make clear			0	0	0	5	4	32	24	4.15	993/166	5 4.15	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15
		estions reflect			0	0	2	6	8	13	36	4.15	894/142	1 4.15	3.49	4.24	4.11	4.15
4. Did oth	ner evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	26	2	3	5	15	13	3.89	1173/161	7 3.89	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.89
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	16	1	4	14	10	19	3.88	963/155	3.88	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.88
6. Did wri	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	37	0	1	6	9	10	4.08	850/154	3 4.08	3.48	4.06	3.86	4.08
		system clearly		ined	1	0	2	1	7	13	41	4.41	651/164			4.12	4.06	4.41
	_	was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	0	63	5.00	1/166		4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you gı	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	12	2	1	2	5	26	17	4.10	857/160	5 4.10	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.10
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	1	2	10	49	4.73	489/151	4.73	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.73
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	2	5	56	4.86	650/155		4.36	4.66	4.55	4.86
	as lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1	4	5	21	29	4.22	914/150			4.24	4.17	4.22
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	3	1	4	12	42	4.44	731/150	5 4.44	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.44
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						1	0	6	24	28	4.32	397/131	1 4.32	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.32
ו היי די		Discus			40	0	_	1	2	7	7	2 42	1106/140	2 12	2 52	4 05	2 05	2 42
				what you learned d to participate	42	0	5 1	1	3 7	7	7 6		1196/149			4.05	3.85	3.43
					42	0	4		3	6	_		1287/150			4.26	4.06	3.57
		chniques succe		d open discussion	42 43	0 4	0	3 1	3	6 6	7 8	4.17	1321/148 424/100		3.59 3.68	4.29	4.07	3.39 4.17
4. Were St	pecial tec	cilitques succe	ssiui		43	4	U		3	0	0	4.1/	424/100	9 4.1/	3.00	4.00	3.01	4.17
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	64	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	3 ****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribu	te to wi	hat you learned	64	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 5	3 ****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you	ı clearly	understand you	ur eval	uation criteria	64	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 5	2 ****	4.00	4.06	3.81	***
		Self	Dogod															
1 Did sel	lf-paced s			what you learned	63	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 5	5 ****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****
		ions make clea:			63	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 4	-		4.31		***
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			T	/pe			Majors	5		
00-27	00-27 11 0.00-0.99 1 A 16							 ed f	or M	 aior	 s	3	 Gradua	 -e	 0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 21		100	2411	I	O1 P1	⊥∪ر ت	~	_	Gradua		Č	11000	-	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 18		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-	arad	65	Non-	major	65
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 1								-		,			5 2	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				3	#### -	Means	there a	are not	enouc	gh
	Р 0													ses to			_	-
	I 0										5	0	-					
? 0																		

Course Section: CHEM 300 0101 University of Maryland

Page 287 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A) Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Eν	eque	naia	c		Tnat	tructor	Course	Dent.	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			0	0	1	0	4	13	4		1313/1669		3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	1164/1666	3.95	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.95
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1061/1421	3.91	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.91
4. Did oth	ıer evalı	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	12	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1279/1617		3.45	4.15	4.22	3.70
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	622/1555	4.19	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.19
		_		o what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.14
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	933/1647	4.18	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.18
	-	was class cano			0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ıll teac	ching effectiveness	2	1	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	1293/1605	3.70	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.70
		Lectur	re															
l. Were th	e instru	actor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	553/1514	4.68	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.68
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	1069/1551	4.64	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.64
B. Was led	ture mat	erial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	0	0	1	3	2	8	8	3.86	1184/1503	3.86	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.86
l. Did the	lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	2	0	4	5	10	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.00
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	4	0	3	2	6	7	3.94	654/1311	3.94	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.94
		Discus	gion															
l Did cla	aa diaa			what you learned	15	0	2	1	2	1	1	2 71	1412/1490	2.71	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.71
				ed to participate	16	0	2	0	1	2	1		1395/1502		3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00
				nd open discussion	16	0	1	0	2	1	2		1279/1489		3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50
		chniques succe		d open discussion	16	4	1	0	0	1	0		****/1006		3.68	4.00	4.10	****
		T = la =																
l Did the	lah ind	Labora	-	of the material	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	108/ 226	4.38	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38
			_	ground information	6	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.30	135/ 233		4.02	4.19	4.17	4.13
_	_	_		for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.13	112/ 225		4.06	4.19	4.13	4.13
	_				6		0	0	2	5	9	4.44					4.27	4.44
		structor provid		early specified	6	0	0	0	2	5 6	8	4.44	124/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.27	4.44
). were re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts ci	early specified	ь	U	U	U	2	ь	8	4.38	95/ 206	4.38	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.38
		Semina		1 1	0.1	0	•		•	-	•	4 00	**** / 110	de de de de	****	4 20	4 50	****
. were as	ssignea t	copics relevant	to the	e announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	***	* * * * *	4.38	4.53	^ ^ ^ ^
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5		
 00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0				anir	ed f	 or M	aior		1	 Graduat		0	Majo		 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		1000	-1011	-u -	J. 1'I	⊥∪ر م	~	-	Siddual	_	5	114)		J
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-q	rad ?	22	Non-	-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 2		Gel	ııcı a	_				4	onder -9	rau 2	. 4	14011-	ilia JOI	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 4	F 0		וק	ecti	WAC				0	#### -	Meane +	here :	re not	enouc	rh
	U	3.30-4.00	T	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v C D				J	respons				_	1++
craa.																		
Graa.				I O		O+1	her				1	.8	I CBPOIIB	CB CO L	oc bigi	iiiicai		

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

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: CHORNOGUZ, OLES (Instr. B) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 288

					Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	1	0	4	13	4	3.86	1313/1669	3.86	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	2	9	8		1164/1666	3.95	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.95
		estions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	2	6	6	8		1061/1421	3.91	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.91
	_	ations reflect	_		0	12	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1279/1617	3.70	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.70
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	622/1555	4.19	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.19
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.14
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explair	ied	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	933/1647	4.18	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.18
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	8	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1187/1605	3.70	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.70
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	-	repared	18	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1514	4.68	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.68
		ctor seem intere	_	_	18	0	0	0	2	1	1		****/1551	4.64		4.66	4.70	4.64
		erial presented		_	18	0	0	2	0	1	1		****/1503	3.86	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.86
		es contribute to			18	0	0	1	1	0	2		****/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.00
			_	ır understanding	18	3	1	0	0	0	0		****/1311			3.85		3.94
1 544 -1.		Discuss ussions contribu			1 -	^	2	1	2	1	1	0 71	1410/1400	0 71	2 52	4.05	1 11	0 71
				_	15 16	0	2 2	1	2 1	1 2	1		1412/1490		3.53	4.05	4.11	2.71
		nts actively end				0	1	0	2	1	_		1395/1502	3.00 3.50	3.84			3.50
		_		open discussion	16 16	4	1	0	0	1	0		1279/1489 ****/1006	3.5U ****	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.5U ****
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succes	sslul		10	4	Т	U	U	1	U	2.50	***/1006		3.68	4.00	4.10	
		Laborat	_															
		crease understan			6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	108/ 226	4.38	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38
				cound information	6	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	135/ 233	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.13
	_			lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6			112/ 225	4.63	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63
		structor provide			6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	124/ 223	4.44	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.44
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	95/ 206	4.38	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.38
		Seminar	?															
1. Were a	ssigned t	copics relevant	to the a	nnounced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio:	n									
Consider To		G GD 3	The same of Consider				De		_			m				M =		
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades					ason	.s 			Ту]	pe 			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 2														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
		P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	nificar	ıt			
		I 0		Otl	ner				1	.8								
	? 1																	

Course Section: CHEM 300 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Title Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. C) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 26

Page 289

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 4 13 4 3.86 1313/1669 3.86 3.81 4.23 4.28 3.86 0 0 1 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 2 9 8 3.95 1164/1666 3.95 3.72 4.19 4.20 3.95 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 6 6 8 3.91 1061/1421 3.91 3.49 4.24 4.25 3.91 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 12 0 1 3 4 2 3.70 1279/1617 3.70 3.45 4.15 4.22 3.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 0 5 3 8 4.19 622/1555 4.19 3.79 4.00 4.03 4.19 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 15 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 783/1543 4.14 3.48 4.06 4.14 4.14 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 3 6 11 4.18 933/1647 4.18 3.70 4.12 4.14 4.18 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.91 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 1 2 6 2 3.82 1164/1605 3.70 3.76 4.07 4.09 3.70 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 18 0 0 1 0 2 1 3.75 ****/1514 4.68 4.13 4.39 4.46 4.68 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 1 1 3.50 ****/1551 4.64 4.36 4.66 4.70 4.64 18 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 18 0 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 ****/1503 3.86 3.91 4.24 4.28 3.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 2 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1506 4.00 3.80 4.26 4.30 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 2 1 1 2.71 1412/1490 2.71 3.53 4.05 4.11 2.71 16 0 0 1 2 1 3.00 1395/1502 3.00 3.84 4.26 4.28 3.00 0 2 1 2 3.50 1279/1489 3.50 3.59 4.29 4.35 3.50 16 4

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/1006 **** 3.68 4.00 4.10 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 6 8 4.38 108/ 226 4.38 4.02 4.20 4.17 4.38 0 2

2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 0 3 8 5 4.13 135/233 4.13 4.08 4.19 4.13 4.13 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 0 0 6 10 4.63 112/ 225 4.63 4.35 4.50 4.45 4.63 6 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 124/ 223 4.44 4.14 4.35 4.27 4.44 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 0 2 6 8 4.38 95/ 206 4.38 3.87 4.15 4.08 4.38

Seminar

21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.53 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme

Credits E	Credits Earned		Ĺ	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 300 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Fall 2006

Title Instructor: YANG, DONG (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 290 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u dain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	4	13	4	3 86	1313/1669	3.86	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	2	9	8		1164/1666		3.72	4.19	4.20	3.95
		estions reflec			0	0	0	2	6	6	-		1061/1421			4.24		3.91
	_	ations reflect		_	0	12	0	1	3	4			1279/1617		3.45	4.15	4.22	3.70
				what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3		4.19			3.79	4.00	4.03	4.19
	_	-		o what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	2			783/1543		3.48	4.06		4.14
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	2	3	6			933/1647		3.70	4.12		4.18
		was class canc		IIIeu	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1668		4.91	4.67		5.00
				hing effectiveness	11	2	0	1	4	2			1334/1605					3.70
9. HOW WO	uiu you g	grade the overa	II Leac	ning effectiveness	11	2	U		4	4	4	3.30	1334/1005	3.70	3.70	4.07	4.09	3.70
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	18	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1514	4.68	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.68
		ctor seem inter			18	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/1551	4.64	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.64
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	18	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1503	3.86	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.86
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.00
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al.				what you learned	15	0	2	1	2	1	1	2 71	1412/1490	2 71	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.71
						0	2	0	1	2			1395/1502		3.84			3.00
				d to participate	16			-								4.26	4.28	
				d open discussion	16	0 4	1 1	0	2	1			1279/1489	3.50 ****	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50 ***
4. were s	pecial te	echniques succe	SSIUI		16	4	T	U	U	Τ	U	2.50	****/1006	***	3.68	4.00	4.10	^ ^ ^ ^
		Labora																
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	108/ 226	4.38	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38
2. Were ye	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	6	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	135/ 233	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.13
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	112/ 225	4.63	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	124/ 223	4.44	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.44
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	95/ 206	4.38	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.38
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t			announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	***	****	4.38	4.53	****
				P		- 5 -2												
				Frequ	lency	DIST	tribi	utioi	1									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	 quir	 ed f	or Ma	 aior		1	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9			`		10)	-	_	o_aaaac	-	-	٠,٠٠٠)		•
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad ?	2	Non-	-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 2		JCI	u.	-				_	onaci g		-	14011	101	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		ភ្ជ	ecti	760				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enouc	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	7	P 0		17.7	CCLI	vca				J	respons				_	111
				I O		O+1	her				1	.8	respons	es co D	e sigi	ıııcdı	.1 C	
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						TICT					U						
				; T														

Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY

Enrollment: 90 Questionnaires: 46

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 291 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General	_			_					- 45 / 4 0					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	16	25	4.47	647/1669	4.47	3.81		4.28	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3 2	19 11	22	4.38	727/1666	4.38	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2 1	24	0	0	6	5	31 10	4.66 4.19	405/1421 863/1617	4.66 4.19	3.49 3.45	4.24 4.15	4.25	4.66 4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	6	8	13	12		1212/1555	3.53	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	380/1543	4.52	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	11	28	4.52	458/1647	4.52	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	20	13	4.21	737/1605		3.76	4.07	4.09	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	6	36	4.79	376/1514	4.79	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	38	4.86	622/1551	4.86	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	15	22	4.33	811/1503	4.33	3.91		4.28	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	11	30	4.60	547/1506	4.60	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	27	1	2	4	1	6	3.64	861/1311	3.64	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were special techniques successful	39	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	***	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	***	3.87	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	1	U	U	0	U	1	5.00	****/ 29			4.34	4.13	

Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

ARNOLD, BRADLEY

Enrollment: 90
Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 291 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	19						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	44	Non-major	39
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED LAB I Baltimore County

Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 18

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 292

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 14 3 4.18 1014/1669 4.28 3.81 4.23 4.28 4.18 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 4 11 1 3.71 1358/1666 3.92 3.72 4.19 4.20 3.71 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 11 0 1 2 3 0 3.33 1292/1421 3.71 3.49 4.24 4.25 3.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 1 0 3 7 5 3.94 1126/1617 4.22 3.45 4.15 4.22 3.94 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 7 6 4.12 698/1555 4.22 3.79 4.00 4.03 4.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 11 4 4.19 735/1543 4.39 3.48 4.06 4.14 4.19 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 2 1 3 5 6 3.71 1300/1647 3.97 3.70 4.12 4.14 3.71 1 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 428/1668 4.96 4.91 4.67 4.68 4.94 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 0 10 4 4.13 820/1605 3.79 3.76 4.07 4.09 3.75 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 8 6 4.43 923/1514 4.07 4.13 4.39 4.46 4.05 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 2 13 4.87 622/1551 4.57 4.36 4.66 4.70 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 1 6 6 4.38 742/1503 4.35 3.91 4.24 4.28 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 7 5 4.14 995/1506 4.10 3.80 4.26 4.30 4.14 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 7 2 1 0 1 1 2.60 1213/1311 3.13 3.57 3.85 3.97 2.60 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 2 6 2 4.00 849/1490 4.27 3.53 4.05 4.11 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 1 3 3 2 3.67 1253/1502 4.04 3.84 4.26 4.28 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 4 2 2 3.56 1258/1489 3.97 3.59 4.29 4.35 3.56 4. Were special techniques successful 9 8 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1006 **** 3.68 4.00 4.10 **** Laboratory 89/ 226 4.59 4.02 4.20 4.17 4.45 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.18 123/233 4.40 4.08 4.19 4.13 4.18 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 179/225 4.31 4.35 4.50 4.45 4.09 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 1 2 2 6 4.18 152/ 223 4.47 4.14 4.35 4.27 4.18 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7 0 1 1 0 4 5 4.00 117/ 206 4.40 3.87 4.15 4.08 4.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.29 **** Frequency Distribution Reasons Type Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 2.00-2.99 3 C 2 00-27 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 7 1.00-1.99 0 28-55 0 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 General 0 Under-grad 18 Non-major 11 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 D 0

Electives

Other

0

18

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F 0

P 0

I 0

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland
Title ADVANCED LAB I Baltimore County

Title ADVANCED LAB I
Instructor: SUN, JIAN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2006

Page 293 JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	eque:	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1 Did voi	u dain n	ew insights,ski		this course	1	0	0	0	0	14	3	4 18	1014/16	59	4.28	3.81	4 23	4.28	4.18
-	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	4	11	1		1358/16		3.92	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.71
		uestions reflec	_	_		11	0	1	2	3	0		1292/14:			3.49	4.24	4.25	3.33
	_	uations reflect	_	-	1	1	1	0	3	7	5		1126/16		4.22	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.94
		eadings contrib	_	_	1	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	698/15		4.22	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.12
	_	_		what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	735/15	13	4.39	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.19
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y explair	ned	1	0	2	1	3	5	6	3.71	1300/16	17	3.97	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.71
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/16	58	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.94
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	5	0	3.50	1357/16)5	3.79	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.75
		Lectur	e																
		uctor's lecture			12	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1352/15	L 4	4.07	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.05
		ctor seem inter		3	11	0	0	0	2	2	3		1377/15		4.57	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.50
		terial presente	_	-	14	0	0	1	2	0			****/15		4.35	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.38
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what yo	ou learned	14	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/15	06	4.10	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.14
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to wh	nat you learned	8	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	849/14	90	4.27	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.00
		nts actively en			9	0	0	1	3	3	2		1253/15		4.04	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.67
		_		open discussion	9	0	0	1	4	2	2		1258/14		3.97	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.56
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		9	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	06	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
		Labora	-																
		crease understa	_		7	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	89/ 2		4.59		4.20	4.17	4.45
_	_	_	_	cound information	7	0	0	1	1	4		4.18			4.40	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.18
	_			lab activities	7	0	0	0	3	4		4.09	179/ 2		4.31	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.09
		structor provid			7	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	152/ 2		4.47	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.18
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts clea	arly specified	7	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	117/ 2)6	4.40	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.00
1 5 1 6 1		Field			1.0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1 00	and and a	- 0	de de de de	2 00	4 00	4 00	de de de de
I. Did fie	ета ехре	rience contribu	te to wha	it you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s				Гурє	е			Majors		
00-27	1	 A 7		Red	auir	ed f	 or M.	 aior	 `S	0	 Gradu	ate		0	Majc	 or	7		
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	В 6						, 01	-	-				-	- 100) 0	. •	•
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Gei	nera	1				0	Under	-gra	ad 1	.8	Non-	major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0										_				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	####	- M∈	eans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 0																ifican	_	
		I 0		Otl	ner				1	8	_								
		? 3																	

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland
Title ADVANCED LAB I Baltimore County

Title ADVANCED LAB I
Instructor: BALU, RAD (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 14 3 4.18 1014/1669 4.28 3.81 4.23 4.28 4.18 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 4 11 1 3.71 1358/1666 3.92 3.72 4.19 4.20 3.71 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 11 0 1 2 3 0 3.33 1292/1421 3.71 3.49 4.24 4.25 3.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 1 0 3 7 5 3.94 1126/1617 4.22 3.45 4.15 4.22 3.94 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 4 7 6 4.12 698/1555 4.22 3.79 4.00 4.03 4.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 11 4 4.19 735/1543 4.39 3.48 4.06 4.14 4.19 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 2 1 3 5 6 3.71 1300/1647 3.97 3.70 4.12 4.14 3.71 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 428/1668 4.96 4.91 4.67 4.68 4.94 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 0 0 3 5 0 3.63 1299/1605 3.79 3.76 4.07 4.09 3.75 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 ****/1514 4.07 4.13 4.39 4.46 4.05 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/1551 4.57 4.36 4.66 4.70 4.50 14 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/1503 4.35 3.91 4.24 4.28 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/1506 4.10 3.80 4.26 4.30 4.14 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 2 6 2 4.00 849/1490 4.27 3.53 4.05 4.11 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 1 3 3 2 3.67 1253/1502 4.04 3.84 4.26 4.28 3.67 9 0 0 1 4 2 2 3.56 1258/1489 3.97 3.59 4.29 4.35 3.56 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 8 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1006 **** 3.68 4.00 4.10 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 89/ 226 4.59 4.02 4.20 4.17 4.45 4 5 4.18 123/ 233 4.40 4.08 4.19 4.13 4.18 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 1 1 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 179/225 4.31 4.35 4.50 4.45 4.09 7 0 0 1 2 2 6 4.18 152/ 223 4.47 4.14 4.35 4.27 4.18 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7 0 1 1 0 4 5 4.00 117/ 206 4.40 3.87 4.15 4.08 4.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.29 **** Frequency Distribution

Fall 2006

Page 294

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0		7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	3						

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0201 ADVANCED LAB I

University of Maryland Page 295 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A) Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	690/1669	4.28	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	881/1666	3.92	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	797/1421	3.71	3.49	4.24	4.25	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	347/1617	4.22	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	461/1555	4.22	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	226/1543	4.39	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	697/1647	3.97	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1092/1605	3.79	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1160/1514	4.07	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12		1000/1551	4.57	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	823/1503	4.35	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	6		1042/1506	4.10	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	4	1			846/1311		3.57		3.97	3.67
o. Dia additipadi dedimiques dimande fedi anadistanding	-	-	ŭ	_	-	_		3.07	010/1011	3.13	3.37	3.03	3.77	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	340/1490	4.27	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.28	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	3.97	3.59	4.29	4.35	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
T all assat assat														
Laboratory	-	0	^	^	0	_	0	4 00	42 / 226	4 50	4 00	4 00	4 1 7	4 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2 1	8 9	4.80	43/ 226	4.59	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		-	-	0	1	2	-	4.73	55/ 233	4.40	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0		1		8	4.64				4.50	4.45	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	42/ 223	4.47	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	U	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 206	4.40	3.87	4.15	4.08	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations . Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0201 University of Maryland Page 295 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 ADVANCED LAB I Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
		? 0									

ADVANCED LAB I

Instructor: BALU, RAD (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 18
Ouestionnaires: 17

(Instr. C)

Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 8 4.44 690/1669 4.28 3.81 4.23 4.28 4.44 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 5 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 1 0 7 4.25 881/1666 3.92 3.72 4.19 4.20 4.25 0 2 4 5 4.27 797/1421 3.71 3.49 4.24 4.25 4.27 347/1617 4.22 3.45 4.15 4.22 4.64 0 1 3 10 4.64 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 1 8 7 4.38 461/1555 4.22 3.79 4.00 4.03 4.38 0 0 4 9 4.69 226/1543 4.39 3.48 4.06 4.14 4.69 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
9. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 1 0 1 4 10 4.38 697/1647 3.97 3.70 4.12 4.14 4.38 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1668 4.96 4.91 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 2 00 3 1 0 3.25 ****/1605 3.79 3.76 4.07 4.09 3.85 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 Ω 0 2 0 3.33 ****/1514 4.07 4.13 4.39 4.46 4.13 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 ****/1551 4.57 4.36 4.66 4.70 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1503 4.35 3.91 4.24 4.28 4.31 0 4.00 ****/1506 4.10 3.80 4.26 4.30 4.07 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 2 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1311 3.13 3.57 3.85 3.97 3.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 5 4.67 340/1490 4.27 3.53 4.05 4.11 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 2 3 4.60 540/1502 4.04 3.84 4.26 4.28 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 00 0 0 2 3 4.60 596/1489 3.97 3.59 4.29 4.35 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 12 3 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1006 **** 3.68 4.00 4.10 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 8 4.80 43/ 226 4.59 4.02 4.20 4.17 4.80 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 Ω 1 1 9 4.73 55/ 233 4.40 4.08 4.19 4.13 4.73 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 1 0 1 2 8 4.64 110/ 225 4.31 4.35 4.50 4.45 4.64 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 42/ 223 4.47 4.14 4.35 4.27 4.91 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 0 11 5.00 0 0 1/ 206 4.40 3.87 4.15 4.08 5.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 4.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.53 **** 16 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.12 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.22 4.47 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 Ω 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 4.45 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 4.15 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.29 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.06 3.59 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 **** 16 0 0 0 1 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16 0 0 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 3.00 3.97 3.34 **** 0 0 1 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 3.49 **** Self Paced 16 0 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.40 4.34 4.03 **** 16 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 42 **** 3.20 4.31 4.13 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students
16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 4.13 ****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 3.00 ****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students
16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.13 ****

Page 296 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029 Course Section: CHEM 311L 0201 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED LAB I Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

(Instr. C)

Instructor: BALU, RAD

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2006

Page 296

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				2	0						

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA

Enrollment: 195 Questionnaires: 102 H, TIFFA Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 297 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_	_					- 4 - 1					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	13	24	62	4.47	647/1669	4.49	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	16	31	52	4.36	740/1666	4.37	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	4	5	12	29	49	4.15	894/1421	4.24	3.49	4.24	4.25	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	40	3	2	14	13	26		1056/1617	4.09	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	2	3 2	13 9	26	44	4.22	592/1555	4.28	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3 4	62 1	1	2	9 15	13 25	13 54	4.00	895/1543	4.08	3.48 3.70	4.06	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	15	∠5 2	95	4.33	775/1647 357/1668	4.43 4.96	4.91	4.12 4.67	4.14 4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		3	0	2	10	47	95 27	4.15	800/1605	4.32	3.76	4.07	4.00	4.15
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	U	2	10	4/	۷ /	4.13	800/1003	4.32	3.70	4.07	4.09	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	8	18	70	4.61	679/1514	4.64	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	7	89	4.89	567/1551	4.91	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	14	31	49	4.32	811/1503	4.37	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	9	21	62	4.42	744/1506	4.41	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	27	8	5	22	14	19	3.46	967/1311	3.51	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.46
Discussion			_			_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	2	1	10	7	7		1120/1490	3.59	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	0	2	4	3	15		****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	0	3	5	6	11		****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were special techniques successful	78	17	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	100	0	0	0	1	1	0	3 50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	100	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	100	0	0	0	1	1	0		,	****	4.14	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	100	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.08	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	101	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	101	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****
T' 11 T' 1														
Field Work	100	0	-	0	_	0	-	2 00	****	****	2 00	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	100	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 58		3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	101	0	0	0	1	0 1	0	3.00 4.00	****/ 39 ****/ 40	****		4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	101 101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	3.97 4.33	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	TOT	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 30		*	4.33	3.49	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	101	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	101	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA

Enrollment: 195 Questionnaires: 102 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 297 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	В	24						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	6	C	32	General	1	Under-grad	100	Non-major	95
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	21	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	80				
				?	6						

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.

Enrollment: 195
Questionnaires: 101

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 298 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	19	67	4.51	578/1669	4.49	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	12	32	55	4.39	715/1666	4.37	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	22	59	4.33	746/1421	4.24	3.49	4.24	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	44	0	3	9	19	26	4.19	863/1617	4.09	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	11	31	51	4.34	484/1555	4.28	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	74	1	1	4	7	13	4.15	771/1543	4.08	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	9	23	66	4.53	446/1647	4.43	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	96	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	0	5	31	51	4.49	398/1605	4.32	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	22	74	4.67	569/1514	4.64	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.6
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	94	4.93	358/1551	4.91	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.9
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	9	34	55	4.41	702/1503			4.24	4.28	4.4
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	9	23	62	4.39	779/1506			4.26	4.30	4.3
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	44	4	3	17	18	12	3.57	904/1311	3.51	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.5
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	92	0	4	0	0	1	4	3.11	****/1490	3.59	3.53	4.05	4.11	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	91	0	1	0	4	0	5	3.80	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.28	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	90	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.35	* * *
4. Were special techniques successful	89	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	95	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.17	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	96	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.13	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	96	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.45	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	96	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.27	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	96	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 206	***	3.87	4.15	4.08	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	100	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	99	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	100	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	* * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	100	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	100	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	***
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 22		Re	quir	 ed f	or M	ajor	`s	0	 Graduat	 e	 1	 Majo	 r	3

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	33	1.00-1.99	1	В	50						
56-83	19	2.00-2.99	14	C	20	General	1	Under-grad	100	Non-major	98
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	46	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	s there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	94	-		_	
				2	_						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 299 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General	•	•	_	_	_	_	_		000/4550					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	889/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4		1094/1666		3.72	4.19	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	2	1		1302/1421		3.49	4.24	4.25	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	2		1155/1555		3.79	4.00	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	735/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	2		1043/1647		3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	436/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.79
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	861/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	965/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00
Discussion			_			_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	2	0		1328/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	0	0		1463/1502		3.84	4.26	4.28	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	0	1	0		1454/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	117/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	80/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	85/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	69/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	U	U	_	U	U	U	2.00	/ 50			3.95	1.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	3.4U ****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.45	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.13	***
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	10	U	J	5	J	J	_	5.00	, 29			1.51	1.10	

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 299 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

13

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: Questionnaires: 11

Enrollment:

ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. B)

Page 300 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Quest:	lonnaire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	----------

Ouestions	NR	NΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	889/1669	3.98		4.23	4.28	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4		1094/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	2			1302/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4		4.20	863/1617	3.58		4.15	4.22	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	2		1155/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1 2	4 7	5	4.18	735/1543 1043/1647	3.77	3.48	4.06 4.12	4.14	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1668	3.68 4.94	3.70 4.91	4.12	4.14	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	857/1605	3.87		4.07		4.27
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	3	4	-1	4.03	837/1003	3.07	3.70	4.07	4.09	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	4		1100/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	6		1028/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4			1005/1503	4.09		4.24	4.28	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	3			1236/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1463/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1454/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	117/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	80/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	85/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	69/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	***	****	3.95	4.15	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	***	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.40	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
5 1														

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 300 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0201 University of Maryl Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 301
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 15

Furoriment.	ΤD
Questionnaires:	14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1320/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	1	5	5	3.86	1273/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.86
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	2	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1332/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.17
		ations reflect			0	0	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1345/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.57
				hat you learned	0	0	1	2	3	7	1		1319/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.36
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	7	2		1130/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.77
		g system clearl		ned	0	0	2	1	2	3	6		1295/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.71
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0 4	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How wou	ıla you g	grade the overa	II teacn	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	800/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.08
		Lectur																
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	, -		4.13	4.39	4.46	4.21
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	5	9		1055/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.28
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	6		914/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.97
		es contribute t	_		0	0	0	2	2	4	6		1069/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.86
5. Did aud	liovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	0	10	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	445/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.25
		Discus																
				hat you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	2		1154/1490		3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50
				to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	1		1208/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.75
		_		open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1489		3.59	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	sstul		11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
		Labora	_															
		crease understa	_		0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	- ,		4.02	4.20	4.17	4.14
				round information	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	. ,	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.36
	_			r lab activities	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43		4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.43
		structor provid			0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	164/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	117/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	рe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А 5		 Re	auir	ed f	or Ma			0	 Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		100	-1411	ca I	O1 110		~	J	Gradac	_	•	1100)	-	_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	4	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		-						-					5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	gh
				P 0									respons				_	-
				I 0		Ot	her				1	.2	-					

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0201 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Instructor: ZHAO, CHUMANG (Instr. B) Enrollment: 15

Ouestionnaires: 14

Page 302 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

guestionnaires. If	al bC	Буат	aacı	OII Q	ucb c	LOIIII	alle							
			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1320/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	5	3.86	1273/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1332/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1345/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	7	1	3.36	1319/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1130/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1295/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1443/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1250/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.97
4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	Ο	Ω	2	2	4	3	3 73	1254/1506	3 90	3 80	4 26	4 30	3 86

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73 1254/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00 ****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.25
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50 1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75 1208/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00 ****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	***
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	134/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	104/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	136/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	117/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-		-	
				2	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0301 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 303

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 12
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	2	0	6	4	4.00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	4	5		1048/1666		3.72	4.19	4.20	4.08
		estions reflec			0	3	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1072/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.89
	_	ations reflect			0	1	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1168/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.91
			_	hat you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	644/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.17
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1006/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.92
		g system clearl		-	0	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1223/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.83
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
				ing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6		4.18	769/1605				4.09	4.15
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	441/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.63
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.65
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	800/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.29
					0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	757/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.96
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned daudiovisual techniques enhance your understand					9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311		3.57	3.85	3.97	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
				to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1502		3.84	4.26	4.28	****
				open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding of	the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	77/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.50
				round information	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	139/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.10
				r lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	127/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.50
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	98/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.60
		nts for lab rep			2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	107/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.20
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00 07	1	0.00.0.00																
00-27 28-55	1 3	0.00-0.99	0	A 4 B 3		кес	quir	ea I	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	3
		1.00-1.99	0	В 3 С 2		a		1				0	TTm d and and		2	Mar		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0			Gei	nera	T				U	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	- *		п.						0	ииии ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. la			-la
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0 P 0		E⊥€	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1][]
				- *		a. •	L				_	1	respons	es to £	e sign	ıırıcan	l L	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.1						
				? 0														

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0301 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 304

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

									Fre	anıer	ncies			Tnat	tructor	Course	e Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
1 5'			Genera		. 1 .		0	•	0	0	•	_	4	4 00	1100/1660	2 00	2 01	4 00	4 00	4 00
	_		insights,ski			е	0	0	0	2	0	6			1173/1669		3.81		4.28	4.00
			or make clear			_	0	0	0	1	2	4			1048/1666		3.72	4.19	4.20	4.08
			estions reflec			S	0	3 1	0 1		2	3			1072/1421		3.49	4.24	4.25	3.89
			tions reflect				0	U T	T	0 1	2 1	4 5			1168/1617 644/1555			4.15	4.22	3.91 4.17
			dings contrib gnments contr				0	0	1	0	2				1006/1543				4.03	
			gnments contr system clearl			earned	0	0	1	0	4				1223/1647			4.06	4.14 4.14	3.92
			system cleari as class canc		iinea		0	0	0	0	0			5.00			3.70 4.91			3.83
	_						3	0	0	0	2	4			1/1668 840/1605					5.00
9. HOW	would	you gr	ade the overa	II tead	ning effectiv	veness	3	U	U	U	2	4	3	4.11	840/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.15
			Lectur	e																
1. Wer	re the i	prepared		4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	799/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.63			
		e the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subje						0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1284/1551		4.36	4.66	4.70	4.65
		the instructor seem interested in the subje lecture material presented and explained cl						0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.29
								0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1319/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.96
5. Did	d audiov	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understa					3	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.33
			_ ,																	
1 544		22	Discus				11	^	0	0	^	^	1	F 00	++++ /1400	2 05	2 52	4 05	4 11	****
			sions contrib		_		11	0	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/1490		3.53		4.11	****
			s actively en	_		-	11	0	1 1	0	0	0			****/1502		3.84	4.26	4.28	****
3. DIC	i the in	struct	or encourage	Lair an	a open aiscus	SSION	11	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	
			Labora	tory																
1. Did	d the la	b incr	ease understa	_	of the materia	al	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	77/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.50
			ed with adequa	_			2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	139/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.10
			naterials avai				2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	127/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.50
			ructor provid				2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	98/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.60
5. Wer	re requi	rement	s for lab rep	orts cl	early specifi	ied	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	107/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.20
						E			L 10											
						Frequ	lency	DIS	LTID	10111	1									
Credit	s Earne	d	Expected (Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}		
00-27	 7 1	 4		Rec	 รบว่า		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		3				
28-55			0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0		3		1000	7 A T T (-u - u) I 1·10	، ١٠٠٠		J	Graduat	_		1.100) (, <u>.</u>	5
56-83			2.00-2.99	0		2		Ger	nera:	ı				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	9
84-15			3.00-3.49	1		0		001	u.	-				~	onder 9		-	1,011		_
Crad			2.00-3.49	_		0		ר מ	-a+i-					٥	шшшш -	Moona +	homo o	20 20t		.h

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 305 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	4		1345/1669		3.81		4.28	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	4		1235/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	1	1		1357/1421		3.49	4.24	4.25	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	3	2		1459/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	2		1087/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	0	3		1138/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	2		1416/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	-,		4.91	4.67	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	719/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	958/1506		3.80	4.26	4.30	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1027/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1417/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1454/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	161/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	181/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	7		102/ 225		4.35	4.50	4.45	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	163/ 206	3.97			4.08	3.67
Carrier														
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4 20	4 52	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10 10	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 97	****	****	4.38	4.53 4.12	****
z. was the instructor available for individual attention	10	U	U	U	U	T	U	4.00	****/ 9/			4.30	4.12	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 305 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title

Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B) Enrollment:

15 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 306 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	4		1345/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1235/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	1	1	3.00	1357/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1459/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1087/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	1138/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1416/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1325/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.79
Lecture		_			_	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	984/1514		4.13	4.39	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	3		1384/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5			996/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	2			1199/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1027/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	Λ	2 67	1417/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	0		1395/1502		3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	-		1454/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/1006		3.68	4.00	4.10	****
4. Were special techniques successiul	0		U	U	U	U	4	5.00	71000	3.75	3.00	4.00	4.10	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	161/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	181/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	102/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	163/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	U	U	U	U		U	1.00	/ 40		3.00	3.91	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 306 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

15 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1		
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough			
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant			
				I O		Other	9						
				?	0								

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0501 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

Instructor:

18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 307

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaner	ncies	:		Tngt	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	10		816/1669	3.98	3.81		4.28	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	7	6		1325/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	4	7	1		1346/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	0	9	4		1290/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	7	6	3.89	955/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4 0	1 1	0	2	8	3 7		1060/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	7 0		5.00	1043/1647	3.68 4.94	3.70 4.91	4.12 4.67	4.14 4.68	4.00 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	3	5	18 5		1/1668 1225/1605	3.87	3.76	4.67	4.08	3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	۷	1	2	U	3	5	5	3.73	1225/1605	3.07	3.70	4.07	4.09	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	892/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	1152/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1127/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1262/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1167/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2 50	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.05	4.11	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/1489		3.59	4.29	4.35	****
5. Did the instructor encourage rail and open discussion	10	O	_	O	O	_	U	2.50	/1105	3.23	3.37	1.20	1.33	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	128/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.24
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	158/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	167/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.19
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	93/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	115/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.06
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****
5. Note official for grading made official	10	_	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	1.00	, 50			3.75	1.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	-		-	-	-	-		. =-			· - -		

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 307 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 18

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB ZINK, NICK

Instructor: Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 18 (Instr. B)

Fall 2006

Page 308 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	-1	0	1	_	1.0	4 22	016/1660	2 00	2 01	4 00	4 00	4 22
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0 1	1	6 7	10	4.33		3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	-	2	_	2		6		1325/1666		3.72	4.19	4.20	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	4	7	1		1346/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	0	9	4		1290/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	7	6	3.89			3.79	4.00	4.03	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	8	3		1060/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	7		1043/1647		3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0 1	0	0	0 2	0	18	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	U	U	2	9	3	4.07	871/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	908/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1381/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	800/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1194/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1072/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.04
_,														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2 50	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/1502		3.84	4.26	4.11	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	10	U		U	U		U	2.50	/1409	3.23	3.39	4.29	4.33	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	128/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.24
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	158/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	167/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.19
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	93/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	115/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.06
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	1	0	0	0	Λ	1 00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	1	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 90			3.95	4.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42	****	3.40	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46	****	3.4U ****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	,	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.13	****
3. Were there enough proceeds for all the students	10	U	4	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 29			1.54	1.13	

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: ZINK, NICK (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 308 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

18 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3	
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	16					
				?	0							

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0601 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Instructor:

SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Page 309 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 17

84-150

Grad.

0

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 3

4

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

1

Ouestionnaires: 1	13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
-------------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

					Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
1 5 1		Genera			0	0	0	0		_		4 00	1100/1660	2 00	2 01	4 00	4 00	4 00
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	4	5	4		1173/1669	3.98	3.81		4.28	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	7	2		1329/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.77
		uestions reflec			0	5	2	0	3	3	0		1383/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	2.88
		ations reflect		1 3	0	0	1	0	5	5			1360/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.54
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4			1309/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.38
				to what you learned	0	3	1	0	5	2	2		1303/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.40
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	2	7	2	2	3.31	1489/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.31
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668		4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1293/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.82
		Lectur	re															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	2	4 00	1199/1514	4.38	4 13	4.39	4.46	4.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	2	2	9		1168/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.41
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	9	_		1193/1503	4.09	3.91		4.28	3.92
		es contribute t			0	0	1	1	2	7			1296/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.81
				your understanding	0	8	0	2	1	1					3.57		3.97	
5. DIG at	la Tovisua.	r recuiriques en	mance y	our understanding	U	8	U	2	1	1	Τ	3.20	1072/1311	3.30	3.5/	3.85	3.97	2.97
		Discus																
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50
				ed to participate	9	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1450/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.75
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1441/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.75
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	essful		8	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
		Labora	atorv															
1. Did th	ne lab ind		-	of the material	6	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	200/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.43
			_	ground information	6	0	0	0	1	2		4.43	96/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.43
_	_	_		for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2		4.29	152/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.29
	_	structor provid			6	0	0	1	1	2		4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00
		_		learly specified	6	0	0	1	2	1	_	3.86	144/ 206		3.87	4.15		3.86
o. were i	equiremen	ics for lab rep	DOILS C.	learly specified	0	U	U	1	4	1	3	3.00	144/ 200	3.97	3.07	4.15	4.00	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 07																		
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3					ке	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	2
	28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 7											2	NT		1.1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	11

Electives

Other

0

13

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0601 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 310

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

-							-											
					Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did vo	u dain n	.Genera ew insights,ski		om this source	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	4 00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	7	2		1329/1666		3.72	4.19	4.20	3.77
		uestions reflect		_	0	5	2	0	3	3	0		1383/1421		3.49	4.24	4.25	2.88
	_	uations reflect			0	0	1	0	5	5	2		1360/1617		3.45	4.15	4.22	3.54
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	2		1309/1555		3.79	4.00	4.03	3.38
				to what you learned	0	3	1	0	5	2	2		1303/1543		3.48	4.06	4.14	3.40
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	2	7	2	2	3.31	1489/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.31
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.82
		Lecture	_															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4 00	1199/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.00
		in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	3		1326/1551		4.36	4.66		4.41		
		explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	_		1066/1503		3.91	4.24	4.28	3.92		
		you learned	6	0	0	1	1	2	3		1069/1506		3.80	4.26		3.81		
				your understanding	5	4	1	1	0	2	0		1195/1311		3.57	3.85	3.97	2.97
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	agg digg			what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	0	3 50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	A 11	3.50
				ed to participate	9	0	0	2	1	1	0		1450/1502		3.84	4.05	4.11	2.75
				nd open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	1	-		1441/1489		3.59	4.29	4.35	2.75
		echniques succes		ia open arbeabbion	8	4	1	0	0	0	0		****/1006		3.68	4.00	4.10	****
	_																	
1 1		Labora	-	6 . 1	_	0	-	-	-	0	0	2 42	000/006	4 11	4 00	4 00	4 15	2 42
		crease understa	_		6	0	1	1	1	2 2	4	3.43 4.43	200/ 226 96/ 233	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17 4.13	3.43 4.43
				ground information for lab activities	6 6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.43			4.08	4.19	4.13	4.43
	-	structor provide			6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.29			4.14	4.35	4.45	4.29
					6	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86				4.15	4.27	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					O	U	U	1	2	1	J	3.00	144/ 200	3.91	3.07	1.13	4.00	3.00
	Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n												
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00.27																		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99					quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		a -		,				0	TTm d a		2	Mar		11
56-83	1 0	2.00-2.99	2 4	C 2		Ge:	nera	Т				0	Under-g	raa l	.3	Non-	-major	11
84-150	U	3.00-3.49	4	ט ע														

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

University of Maryland Course Section: CHEM 351L 0701 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Instructor:

Fall 2006

Page 311

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	SMITH, PAUL J.	(Instr. A)
Enrollment:	16	

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

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

	Questions						Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1 Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3 93	1265/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.93
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	3	6	3		1402/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.64
		uestions reflec			1	2	0	4	1	4	2		1286/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.36
		uations reflect			0	0	1	1	6	3	3		1414/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.43
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	773/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.00
				o what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	3	_		1232/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.58
		g system clearl			1	0	1	2	3	4	3		1411/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.46
		was class canc		illica	2	0	0	0	0	1	-		641/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.92
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	7			1164/1605	3.87		4.07	4.09	3.32
9. HOW WO	outa you g	grade the overa	II teat	ming effectiveness	3	U	Τ	U	1	/	۷	3.02	1104/1005	3.07	3.70	4.07	4.09	3.34
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.14
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	650/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.26
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	914/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.67
		es contribute t			0	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	1038/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.75
		our understanding	0	8	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1084/1311		3.57	3.85	3.97	3.17		
1 541		Discus			11	0	^	0	1	_	0	2 67	±±±±/1400	2 25	2 52	4 05	4 11	****
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	1		****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	
		-	_	ed to participate	10	0	0	1	1	1	1		1301/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.50
				nd open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	Τ		1191/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.75
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	sstul		11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa		of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	108/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38
				ground information	6	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	183/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.75
				for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	142/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.38
		structor provid			6	0	1	0	2	3	_	3.63		4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.63
				early specified	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	178/ 206	3.97		4.15	4.08	3.38
	_					- D	L 2 To.	4	_									
		Frequ	iency	DIS	LTID	utio.	1											
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades	ades Reasons			T			pe			Majors	\$					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	 guir	ed f	or Ma	jor		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 5		_	=			J						3 -		
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-a	rad 1	L4	Non-	-major	13
84-150							u	_				-	Under-grad 14			2.011		-3
Grad.						. רים	ecti	WAG				0	#### - 1	## - Means there a		are not	enous	rh
SI aa.	J	3.30 1.00	1	P 0		11.1		v CD					#### - Means there ar responses to be signi					
				- · ·			Other				1	2	respons	LO L	e sigi	ıııcdı	10	
I 0				Ι 0		UT.	ner.				1	4						

? 2

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0701 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: TANTREVEDI, SAR (Instr. B) Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 14

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 312

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect														
			Fr	eauei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	1265/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1402/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	1	4	2	3.36	1286/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1414/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	773/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1232/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.58
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	0	1	2	3	4	3		1411/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	4	3	2	1	2.82	1538/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1389/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1477/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1413/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1341/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1301/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1191/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	108/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	183/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	142/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	196/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.27	3.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	178/ 206		3.87	4.15		3.38

Credits Ea	arned	rned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-		-	
				2	2						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0801 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

0

Baltimore County

Page 313

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Fall 2006 Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Se
		Questions 		NR 	NA	1	2	3 	-4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Ме
		General															
		ew insights, skills from		1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	,		3.81	4.23	4.28	4.
		ctor make clear the exp	_	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	881/1666		3.72	4.19	4.20	4.
	_	uestions reflect the ex		2	0	1	1	3	2	5		1135/1421		3.49	4.24	4.25	3
		uations reflect the exp		2	1	1	1	2	5	2		1356/1617		3.45	4.15	4.22	3
		eadings contribute to w		3	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	. ,		3.79	4.00	4.03	4
		signments contribute to	_	3	0	0	1	2	3	5		838/1543		3.48	4.06	4.14	4
		g system clearly explai	ned	3	0	1	0	3	1	6		1043/1647		3.70	4.12	4.14	4
		was class cancelled		3	0	0	0	0	2			882/1668		4.91	4.67	4.68	4
How woul	ld you g	grade the overall teach	ing effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1195/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4
		Lecture															
Were the	e instru	actor's lectures well p	repared	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	441/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4
Did the	instruc	ctor seem interested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	705/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4
Was lect	ure mat	terial presented and ex	plained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	556/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4
Did the	lecture	es contribute to what y	ou learned	2	1	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	965/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4
Did audi	lovisual	l techniques enhance yo	ur understanding	2	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	116/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4
		Discussion															
Did clas	ss discu	ussions contribute to w	hat you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3
		nts actively encouraged		10	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1450/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2
		ctor encourage fair and		10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1361/1489		3.59	4.29	4.35	3
Were spe		10	3	0	0	1	0			****/1006		3.68		4.10	*		
		Laboratory															
Did the	lab ind	crease understanding of	the material	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	56/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4
		ded with adequate backq		3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	91/ 233		4.08	4.19	4.13	4
_	_	materials available fo		3	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18			4.35	4.50		4
	_	structor provide assist		3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	73/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.27	4
		nts for lab reports cle		3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	95/ 206			4.15		4
		Seminar															
Were ass	signed t	topics relevant to the	announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	***	****	4.38	4.53	*
Was the	instruc	ctor available for indi	vidual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	*
Did rese	earch pi	rojects contribute to w	hat you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	*
	_	ons contribute to what	_	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	*
		Field Work															
Did fiel	ld expe	rience contribute to wh	at you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	*
			Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
edits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	rades Reasons							Ту	pe			Majors	3	
0-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7		Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	
8-55					~		,					1	, ,				
6-83					Gei	nera.	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	
4-150														,			
rad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	Jh
			P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	niticar	ıt	
			I 0		Otl	ıer				1	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0801 University of Maryland
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16
Ouestionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 314

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 463/1669 3.98 3.81 4.23 4.28 4.62 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 1 2 2 7 4.25 881/1666 3.82 3.72 4.19 4.20 4.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.75 1135/1421 3.33 3.49 4.24 4.25 3.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 1 1 1 2 5 2 3.55 1356/1617 3.58 3.45 4.15 4.22 3.55 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 541/1555 3.75 3.79 4.00 4.03 4.27 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 2 3 5 4.09 838/1543 3.77 3.48 4.06 4.14 4.09 1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 1 0 3 1 6 4.00 1043/1647 3.68 3.70 4.12 4.14 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 882/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.68 4.82 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 335/1605 3.87 3.76 4.07 4.09 4.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 308/1514 4.38 4.13 4.39 4.46 4.79 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 880/1551 4.41 4.36 4.66 4.70 4.79 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 1 0 10 4.82 210/1503 4.09 3.91 4.24 4.28 4.66 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 0 1 0 10 4.82 273/1506 3.90 3.80 4.26 4.30 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 116/1311 3.36 3.57 3.85 3.97 4.80 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 2 3.50 1154/1490 3.25 3.53 4.05 4.11 3.50 1 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 2 0 2.75 1450/1502 3.20 3.84 4.26 4.28 2.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 0 1 1 1 3.25 1361/1489 3.25 3.59 4.29 4.35 3.25 4. Were special techniques successful 10 3 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1006 3.75 3.68 4.00 4.10 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 1 10 4.67 56/ 226 4.11 4.02 4.20 4.17 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 91/ 233 4.11 4.08 4.19 4.13 4.45 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 4 1 6 4.18 167/ 225 4.49 4.35 4.50 4.45 4.18 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 73/ 223 4.18 4.14 4.35 4.27 4.73 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 95/ 206 3.97 3.87 4.15 4.08 4.36 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 4.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.53 **** 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** **** 4.36 4.12 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** *** 4.22 4.47 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 105 **** **** 4.20 4.45 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 Field Work 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.80 4.22 4.29 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0901 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Enrollment: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2006

Page 315

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	_	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1498/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3			1455/1666		3.72	4.19	4.20	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1208/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	1503/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	1	3	4	3.58	1187/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1019/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1522/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	3	1	3.36	1416/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	877/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	986/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	1219/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1260/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1202/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1469/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	162/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	203/ 233		4.08	4.19	4.13	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	112/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	158/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	103/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.25
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0901 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 316

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. B) Enrollment: 16

Ouestionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 2 4 2 4 3.46 1498/1669 3.98 3.81 4.23 4.28 3.46 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 2 3 3 4 3.54 1455/1666 3.82 3.72 4.19 4.20 3.54 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 2 2 2 4 3.55 1208/1421 3.33 3.49 4.24 4.25 3.55 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 2 3 2 2 3 3.08 1503/1617 3.58 3.45 4.15 4.22 3.08 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 4 1 3 4 3.58 1187/1555 3.75 3.79 4.00 4.03 3.58 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 2 2 1 5 3.90 1019/1543 3.77 3.48 4.06 4.14 3.90 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 4 2 3 2 3.08 1522/1647 3.68 3.70 4.12 4.14 3.08 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 3 3 3 2 3.36 1416/1605 3.87 3.76 4.07 4.09 3.36 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 1277/1514 4.38 4.13 4.39 4.46 4.17 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 1404/1551 4.41 4.36 4.66 4.70 4.35 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 1235/1503 4.09 3.91 4.24 4.28 3.88 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 1 0 2 2 3.14 1392/1506 3.90 3.80 4.26 4.30 3.48 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1311 3.36 3.57 3.85 3.97 2.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 0 1 3 3.43 1202/1490 3.25 3.53 4.05 4.11 3.43 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 3 0 2 1 1 2.57 1469/1502 3.20 3.84 4.26 4.28 2.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 1 3 1 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.25 3.59 4.29 4.35 3.00 6 6 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1006 3.75 3.68 4.00 4.10 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 3 3.88 162/226 4.11 4.02 4.20 4.17 3.88

Frequency Distribution

5 0

5 0 0

0

0

2

2 2 3.50 203/233 4.11 4.08 4.19 4.13 3.50

0 0 3 5 4.63 112/ 225 4.49 4.35 4.50 4.45 4.63

0 2 3 3 4.13 158/ 223 4.18 4.14 4.35 4.27 4.13

0 2 2 4 4.25 103/206 3.97 3.87 4.15 4.08 4.25

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_		_	
				2	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment:

16 Questionnaires: 16 Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 317

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	Frequencies			Instructor		tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	7	3	3.60	1437/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	4	5	3.67	1387/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	0	4	4	3.46	1244/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1341/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	676/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	3	6		1115/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	2	2			1331/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0				1017/1668		4.91	4.67	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	3	4			1470/1605			4.07		3.60
J. How would you grade one everall eddoming erreceiveness	ŭ	Ü	_	ŭ		-	_	3.20	11/0/1000	3.07	3.70	1.07	1.05	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	1313/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	0	5	7		1394/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	5	3	3		1399/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	3	2	5		1277/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	2	0	1	2	_		1213/1311			3.85	3.97	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	U		4	U	2.00	1213/1311	3.30	3.37	3.05	3.31	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2 67	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/1006		3.68	4.00	4.10	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	۷	U		U	U	U	2.00	/1000	3.73	3.00	4.00	4.10	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	2 01	160/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	176/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	3		4.55	123/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	3	3		3.91		4.18	4.14		4.45	3.91
<u>-</u>	5 5	0	0	4	1	3	3					4.35		
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	U	U	4	1	3	3	3.45	173/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
		0	0	0	1				****/ 92	****	****	4.22		****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15					0	0		****/ 105	****	****		4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	•	3.00	,	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	^^^	^^^	3.95	4.15	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4 22	4.29	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned		-	-	-	1	-	0		,			4.22		****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Calf Darad														
Self Paced	1 -	^	0	0	1	^	0	2 00	++++/	++++	2 40	1 24	4 02	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

16

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 317 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 16

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor:

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

ZHAO, CHAMANG (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 318 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eval	luation	Questionnai	re
---------	--------	------	---------	-------------	----

		Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank			Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	7	3	3.60	1437/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	4	5	3.67	1387/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	0	4	4	3.46	1244/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1341/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	676/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 1	1	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1115/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	2	2	6	3.64	1331/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	1017/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	2	5	1 22	1022/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	5	4		1239/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	2	3	3		1176/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	2			1277/1506			4.24	4.20	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	2	0		****/1311		3.57	3.85	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	U	U	Τ	2	U	3.67	***/1311	3.30	3.5/	3.85	3.97	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	160/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	4	2	4		176/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	3		4.55	123/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	3	3	-	3.91		4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	4	1	3	3		173/ 206			4.15		3.45
Seminar		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	***	****	4.33	3.49	***
0.35 53														
Self Paced	1 -	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	++++/	****	2 40	4 2 4	4 02	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 55		3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46 ****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	, 55	****		4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	U	U	U	Т	U	0	3.00	****/ 29			4.34	4.13	

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: ZHAO, CHAMANG (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 318 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1101 University of Maryland Page 319 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

15

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1														
General	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4 00	1173/1669	2 00	3.81	1 22	1 20	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3 6			854/1666	3.98 3.82	3.72	4.23 4.19	4.28 4.20	4.00
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	1	1	0	5	1	1			1319/1421		3.49	4.19	4.25	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	_	0	0	2	J	4			1319/1421	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.23	3.60
1 9	2	0	0	2	2 1	_			,				4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	-	-	1	1	6			1087/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00		3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1		1	5	3		1160/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	•	0	4	2	5	4.09	997/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0			4.91	-,		4.91	4.67	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	591/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	,	4.30	4.13	4.59	4.40	4.59
		0	0	0		٦ _		4.55		4.41	3.91	4.24	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1 4	3							4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	-	-	-	_	3			1069/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26		4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	846/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	0	0	2 50	1431/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1		1279/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	0	1		1318/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	1	0		****/1006		3.68	4.00	4.10	****
1. Wele special econicates successful	Ü	3	Ü	O	Ü	_	O	1.00	, 1000	3.73	3.00	1.00	1.10	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	105/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
Freq	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
	_		-											

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

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1101 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Page 320 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

C+11202+	00,,,,,,,	Errolmotion	Oncation	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Question	larre

							Fr	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General	 															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	1	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	854/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.27
		uestions reflect		_	1	1	0	5	1	1	3		1319/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.20
		uations reflect			2	0	0	2	2	4	2		1334/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.60
				what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	6	2		1087/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.73
	_	-		o what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	3		1160/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.73
		g system clearly			1	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	997/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.09
				illied		0	-	0	0	1								
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	1	_	10	4.91	713/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.91
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.28
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	751/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.59
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1231/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.68
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	519/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.55
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27		3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.14
				our understanding	1	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	846/1311		3.57		3.97	3.67
o. Dia au	uiovisua.	i teciniiques em	lance y	our understanding	1	0	U	U	4	U	1	3.07	040/1311	3.30	3.57	3.05	3.97	3.07
		Discuss			6	0												
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						1	1	4	0	0	2.50	1431/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.50
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1279/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.60
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage i	air an	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1318/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.40
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		6	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****
		Laborat	orv															
1 Did th	e lah ind	crease understar	-	of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.56
			_	ground information	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.44
_	_	_		_	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	,					
	_			for lab activities									1/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	5.00
		structor provide			3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.78
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	105/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.22
		Semina	-															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D.C.	asons				т	00			Majors	
CIECTICS F	ariieu	Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades					250115				Ту	 be			majors	, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	L2	Non-	-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot.1	ner					6	-		3			
				3 0			-											

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1201 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Page 321

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4			_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did v	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	3	1	2	6	4	3.44	1511/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.44
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	7	6	2		1466/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.50
		uestions reflec		_	0	2	2	3	1	6	2		1316/1421		3.49	4.24	4.25	3.21
	_	uations reflect			0	4	0	1	3	6	2		1251/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.75
				what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	5	5		1227/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.50
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	3	5		1226/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.60
		g system clearl			0	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1425/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.44
8. How m	nany times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.94
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	4	1	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.95
	_																	
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	1064/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.14
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1055/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.04
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1030/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.04
4. Did t	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1038/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.89
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	7	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1084/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.17
		Labora																
		crease understa			5	0	1	0	3	2			160/ 226		4.02		4.17	3.91
				ground information	5	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	. ,	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.91
	_			or lab activities	5	0	0	1		4		4.00	187/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.00
		structor provid			5	0	1	1	2	5		3.55	199/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.27	3.55
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	5	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	165/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.64
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	oe.			Majors	.
			· 											, . 				. – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
	P 0				respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt									
				Ι 0		Otl	her				1	.3						

1

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1201 University of Maryland ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Title Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B) Fall 2006

Enrollment:	17
-------------	----

Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie		_		tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	2	6	4	3.44	1511/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	6	2	3.50	1466/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	1	6	2	3.21	1316/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1251/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	5	5	3.50	1227/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 0	1	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1226/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1425/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened	ss 5	1	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1092/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1498/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	. 9	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1258/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	ıg 8	5	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	160/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background informati	on 5	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	167/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	s 5	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	187/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	199/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	165/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.64
Fr	equency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	les			Rea	ason	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		 Required for Majors					 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo		2
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 7		Required for Majors					o Graduate 0			Ŭ	114.50	_	_	

Page 322

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	13	-		_		
				?	1							

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1301 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB JAN 18, 2007

Page 323

Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment:	16			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Ere	equer	naia	-		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.60		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	549/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.50		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1205/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.56		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	922/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.14		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	492/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.33		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.50		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.44		
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	690/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.69		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.34		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	843/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.39		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	386/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.23		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	471/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.33		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	****		
Laboratory																
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.83		
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	66/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.67		
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	68/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.83		
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	212/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.27	3.17		
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified			0	1	1	0	4	4.17	110/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.17		
Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	n											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	um. GPA Expected Grades				es Reasons						Туре				Majors	ı

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1301 University of Maryland Baltimore County ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

16

Page 324 Title JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B) Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Instructor			Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2 Eque	2	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
Quescions	ж	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	549/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1205/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	922/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	492/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	1490/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1307/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1404/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1210/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1069/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	66/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	68/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	212/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.17

Frequency Distribution

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 110/ 206 3.97 3.87 4.15 4.08 4.17

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				2	Ω						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1401 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 325

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

0

F

I 0

0

Student Co	urse Evalua	ation Ques	tionnaire
------------	-------------	------------	-----------

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m thia acurac	0	0	0	2	2	5	1	2 05	1326/1669	3.98	2 01	4.23	4.28	3.85
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	4	1			1534/1666			4.23		3.31
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	1	2	3			1304/1421					3.27
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	1	3	4				1503/1617			4.15	4.22	
				what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	_			773/1555				4.22	
				o what you learned	1	1	1	1					1246/1543		3.48	4.06	4.14	
		g system clearl		-	1	0	2	1	2				1435/1647			4.12	4.14	
		was class canc		Illed	1	0	0	0	0			5.00					4.14	
	-			hing offoatiwonoga	2	•	0	0	4	5			1249/1605					
9. HOW WO	outa you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	۷	1	U	U	4	5	1	3.70	1249/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.50
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	861/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.37
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1279/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.13
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1066/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1330/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	7	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3 50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3 50
				d to participate	9		0	1	2	1			1395/1502			4.26		3.00
				d open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	1			1279/1489				4.35	
		Labora	-															
		crease understa			2	0	1	1	2	6			- ,		4.02	4.20	4.17	3.45
				ground information	3		0	0	4	2			146/ 233			4.19		
				or lab activities	2	1	0	0	0			4.80				4.50		4.80
		structor provid			2	0	0	0	2	4			144/ 223				4.27	
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	2	0	0	3	3	2	3	3.45	173/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.45
Fre						/ Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Re:	asons	3			Ty	ne			Majors	
										, 								, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
		0 = 0 4 00	_			_						_						

Electives

Other

0

12

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1401 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: TEMBRUNIKAR, KA (Instr. B) Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 13

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

Page 326

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies In				Inst	Instructor		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1326/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.85
	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	1	4		1534/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.31
	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	2	3	2	3.27	1304/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.27
4		0	1	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1503/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.08
5	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	773/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.00
6	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1246/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.55
7	. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1435/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.42
8	. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1378/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.58
	Lecture														
1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1064/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.37
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1448/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.13
3	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1277/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.83
4	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1389/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.31
5	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00
	Discussion														
1	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50
2	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00
3	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1279/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50
	Laboratory														
1	. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	197/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.45
2	. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	146/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.00
3	. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	75/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.80
4	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance				0	2	4	5	4.27	144/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified				0	3	3	2	3	3.45	173/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.45
Freque				rib	utio	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1501 University of Maryl Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 327
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Quantiona					Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	6	5	1	3.38	1530/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	2	7	1	1	2.77	1614/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	2.77
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	1	1	5	4	1	1	2.67	1397/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	2.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	3	7	1	1	2.85	1562/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	2.85
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	1	4	5	2	0	2.67	1505/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	2.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	2.77	1486/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	2.77
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	3	5	3	2	0	2.31	1601/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	2.31
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.83
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	3.69	1255/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.45
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	799/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.25
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1028/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	3.83
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1157/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.54
		es contribute t			2	1	0	0	6	1	3	3.70	1262/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.18
				our understanding	1	8	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1057/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	***		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa					0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1502		3.84	4.26	4.28	***
				nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489		3.59	4.29	4.35	****
		echniques succe			12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1006		3.68	4.00	4.10	****
		Labora	torv															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understa		of the material	2	0	1	1	4	5	0	3.18	207/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.18
				ground information	2	0	0	0	8	2	1	3.36	211/ 233		4.08	4.19	4.13	3.36
				for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	179/ 225		4.35	4.50	4.45	4.09
		structor provid			2	1	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	210/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.27	3.30
		_		learly specified	2	0	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	187/ 206		3.87	4.15	4.08	3.09
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Тъ	ре			Majors	ı
										- 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 9														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.3						
				? 0														

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1501 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

TANTREVEDI, SAR (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 328

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 13

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 1 3.38 1530/1669 3.98 3.81 4.23 4.28 3.38 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 7 1 1 2.77 1614/1666 3.82 3.72 4.19 4.20 2.77 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 5 4 1 1 2.67 1397/1421 3.33 3.49 4.24 4.25 2.67 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 3 7 1 1 2.85 1562/1617 3.58 3.45 4.15 4.22 2.85 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 4 5 2 0 2.67 1505/1555 3.75 3.79 4.00 4.03 2.67 3 10 0 0 2.77 1486/1543 3.77 3.48 4.06 4.14 2.77 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 5 3 2 0 2.31 1601/1647 3.68 3.70 4.12 4.14 2.31 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 844/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.68 4.83 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 2 4 4 0 3.20 1470/1605 3.87 3.76 4.07 4.09 3.45 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ω Ω Ω 2 2 2 4.00 1199/1514 4.38 4.13 4.39 4.46 4.25 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 2 2 2 0 3.00 1525/1551 4.41 4.36 4.66 4.70 3.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 2 2 1 1 3.17 1407/1503 4.09 3.91 4.24 4.28 3.54 7 0 1 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 2 0 1 2.67 1443/1506 3.90 3.80 4.26 4.30 3.18 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 4 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1311 3.36 3.57 3.85 3.97 3.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1490 3.25 3.53 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/1502 3.20 3.84 4.26 4.28 **** 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1489 3.25 3.59 4.29 4.35 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 4. Were special techniques successful 12 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1006 3.75 3.68 4.00 4.10 **** 1 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 1 5 0 3.18 207/ 226 4.11 4.02 4.20 4.17 3.18 4 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 8 2 1 3.36 211/ 233 4.11 4.08 4.19 4.13 3.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 3 4 4 4.09 179/ 225 4.49 4.35 4.50 4.45 4.09 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 3 4 1 3.30 210/ 223 4.18 4.14 4.35 4.27 3.30 2 1 1 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 4 1 3 2 3.09 187/ 206 3.97 3.87 4.15 4.08 3.09 1

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-		_	
				2	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 17

SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 329 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	4 07	001/1660	2 00	2 01	4 02	4 00	4 07
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0 0	1 0	0 1	2	3 7	9 5	4.27	901/1669 1059/1666	3.98 3.82	3.81 3.72	4.23 4.19	4.28 4.20	4.27 4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	3	5	3		1100/1421	3.82	3.49	4.19	4.25	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	6	3		1154/1617	3.58	3.45	4.24	4.22	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	3 4	3.87	971/1555	3.75	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	857/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	728/1647		3.70	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	654/1605	3.87		4.07	4.09	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	715/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	825/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	852/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	884/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1057/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	2	1		1117/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	3	1		1179/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	1		1038/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	657/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	138/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	124/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	49/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.87
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	82/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.47
Seminar					_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12 12	1	0	0	1	1 1	0 1	3.50 4.50	****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	U	U	U	1	1	4.50	****/ 98			3.95	4.15	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	0		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	3	0		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

Enrollment: 17 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 329 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1601 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Fall 2006

Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 330 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	901/1669	3.98	3.81	1 22	4.28	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3 7	5		1059/1666	3.82	3.72	4.23	4.20	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	3	5	3		1100/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	6	3		1154/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	971/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	857/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	728/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1668			4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	810/1605	3.87		4.07		4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	955/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	7		1160/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	4	4		1020/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	3		4.18	965/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1117/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1179/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	1		1038/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	657/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	138/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	124/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	49/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.87
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	82/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1601 Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 15

Instructor:

ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 330 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1701 University of Maryland ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Title JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A) Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 331

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Se
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Me
General														
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1001/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1094/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	2	4	3.45	1250/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1323/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1207/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1175/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3
Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4
How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	Ę
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1164/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	489/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	936/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	637/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	809/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1233/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1160/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	:
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	
Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	•
Laboratory														
Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	116/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	
Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	66/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	
Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	122/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	
Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	
Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	56/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1701 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 332

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ZINK, NICK (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 13 Ouestionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 5 4.18 1001/1669 3.98 3.81 4.23 4.28 4.18 1 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 3 1 5 4.00 1094/1666 3.82 3.72 4.19 4.20 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 3 1 5 4.00 1094/1666 3.82 3.72 4.19 4.20 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 3 1 2 4 3.45 1250/1421 3.33 3.49 4.24 4.25 3.45 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 0 3 1 3 3.63 1323/1617 3.58 3.45 4.15 4.22 3.63 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 4 2 3 3.55 1207/1555 3.75 3.79 4.00 4.03 3.55 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 4 2 3 3.70 1175/1543 3.77 3.48 4.06 4.14 3.70 1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 4 3 4 4.00 1043/1647 3.68 3.70 4.12 4.14 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1668 4.94 4.91 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 5 5 4.50 373/1605 3.87 3.76 4.07 4.09 4.16 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 Ω 0 1 5 4.83 308/1514 4.38 4.13 4.39 4.46 4.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 1193/1551 4.41 4.36 4.66 4.70 4.61 5 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 5 4.83 191/1503 4.09 3.91 4.24 4.28 4.64 5 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 642/1506 3.90 3.80 4.26 4.30 4.43 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 4 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/1311 3.36 3.57 3.85 3.97 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 3 2 3.33 1233/1490 3.25 3.53 4.05 4.11 3.33 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 3 1 2 3.83 1160/1502 3.20 3.84 4.26 4.28 3.83 5 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 2 1 2 3.50 1279/1489 3.25 3.59 4.29 4.35 3.50 5 4 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1006 3.75 3.68 4.00 4.10 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 2 5 4.33 116/226 4.11 4.02 4.20 4.17 4.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 66/ 233 4.11 4.08 4.19 4.13 4.67 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 122/ 225 4.49 4.35 4.50 4.45 4.56 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 0 2 7 4.78 2 0 0 65/ 223 4.18 4.14 4.35 4.27 4.78 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 56/ 206 3.97 3.87 4.15 4.08 4.67 0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				Р	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-		-	
				2	0						

Course Section: CHEM 405 0101 University of Maryland Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 21

Page 333 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	urse Evaluat:	ion Questionnaire
-------------	---------------	-------------------

Questions	NR 0		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course														.10411
		_												
	0	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	876/1669	4.29	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.29
	0	0	1	0	6	8	6	3.86	1273/1666	3.86	3.72	4.19	4.22	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	7	7	3.76	1131/1421	3.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	7	4	4	3.63	1323/1617	3.63	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	5	4	2	4	2.67	1505/1555	2.67	3.79	4.00	4.08	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	994/1543	3.93	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	728/1647	4.35	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	901/1668	4.81	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	1039/1605	3.93	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	4	9	4.05	1040/1503	4.05	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	838/1506	4.33	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	3	5	1	3	3.15	1088/1311	3.15	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	979/1490	3.86	3.53	4.05	4.26	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	859/1502	4.29	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.39	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	***	3.87	4.15	4.20	****
Freç	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 420 0101

COMUPTER APPL IN CHEM

Title Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 334 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	quen	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	757/1669	4.38	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1572/1666	3.08	3.72	4.19	4.22	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	3.49	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1492/1617	3.17	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1303/1555	3.40	3.79	4.00	4.08	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1060/1543	3.86	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	5	3	1	2.92	1545/1647	2.92	3.70	4.12	4.14	2.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	952/1668	4.77	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	2	4	0	2.80	1540/1605	2.80	3.76	4.07	4.16	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	1343/1514	3.69	4.13	4.39	4.45	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1435/1551	3.92	4.36	4.66	4.73	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	2	3	3	3.15	1409/1503	3.15	3.91	4.24	4.27	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	3	2	2.85	1427/1506	2.85	3.80	4.26	4.29	2.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1006	****		4.00	4.21	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.20	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	***

Course Section: CHEM 420 0101

Title COMUPTER APPL IN CHEM

Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 13

M Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 334 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad 1	L3	Non-major	4	
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here ar	e not enough		
				P	0			responses to b	e signi	ficant		
				I	0	Other	9					
				?	0							

Course Section: CHEM 433 0101

Title BIOCHEM OF NUCLEIC ACI

Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 335 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions							-	ncies				tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1467/1669	3.54	3.81	4.23	4.39	3.54
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1455/1666	3.54	3.72	4.19	4.22	3.54
3. Did th	ie exam qi	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1095/1421	3.85	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.85
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	4	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1448/1617	3.33	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1202/1555	3.56	3.79	4.00	4.08	3.56
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1060/1543	3.86	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.86
		g system clearl		ained	2	0	1	5	1	2	2	2.91	1548/1647	2.91	3.70	4.12	4.14	2.91
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.83
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	4	0	3.20	1470/1605	3.20	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.20
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1383/1514	3.54	4.13	4.39	4.45	3.54
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.85
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1321/1503	3.54	3.91	4.24	4.27	3.54
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1239/1506	3.77	3.80	4.26	4.29	3.77
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	687/1311	3.92	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.92
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned																	
1. Did cl					7	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1391/1490	2.83	3.53	4.05	4.26	2.83
2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1253/1502	3.67	3.84	4.26	4.46	3.67
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	3.59	4.29	4.52	3.83
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		7	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	***
		Semina	ır															
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	***
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available	for ind	dividual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did re	search p	rojects contrik	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	***
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	le clear	<u>c</u>	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
		Field	Work															
2. Did yo	ou clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	luation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	ı									
Credits E	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	;			Ту	рe			Majors	3
00-27	-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6			-1 ~ -1 .		10		-	-	or adda c	-	_			_
56-83						Ger	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	1h
			-	P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	ner					5	-1		5-			
I 0						-												

Course Section: CHEM 437 0101 University of Maryland Title

Questions

COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM Baltimore County Instructor: GARVIE, COLIN (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 165

Ouestionnaires: 53

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

Page 336

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 0 2 6 20 22 4.24 938/1669 4.24 3.81 4.23 4.39 4.24 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 3 2 9 15 21 3.98 1122/1666 3.98 3.72 4.19 4.22 3.98 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6 0 2 2 9 17 17 3.96 1015/1421 3.96 3.49 4.24 4.38 3.96 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 31 1 3 1 7 6 3.78 1240/1617 3.78 3.45 4.15 4.22 3.78 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 2 1 4 8 13 19 4.00 773/1555 4.00 3.79 4.00 4.08 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 32 0 0 2 8 5 4.20 723/1543 4.20 3.48 4.06 4.18 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 6 0 0 0 8 14 25 4.36 713/1647 4.36 3.70 4.12 4.14 4.36 8. How many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 0 2 45 4.96 357/1668 4.96 4.91 4.67 4.70 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 1 3 8 19 14 3.93 1039/1605 3.90 3.76 4.07 4.16 3.90 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 2 7 40 4.78 408/1514 4.63 4.13 4.39 4.45 4.63 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 2 10 37 4.71 954/1551 4.73 4.36 4.66 4.73 4.73

3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 2 6 16 24 4.22 905/1503 4.15 3.91 4.24 4.27 4.15 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 2 5 13 28 4.40 779/1506 4.26 3.80 4.26 4.29 4.26 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 1 0 4 12 28 4.47 291/1311 4.33 3.57 3.85 3.88 4.33 Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 2 2 4 8 2 3.33 1233/1490 3.33 3.53 4.05 4.26 3.33 35 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 1 1 9 4 3.56 1290/1502 3.56 3.84 4.26 4.46 3.56 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion $35 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 4 \ 8 \ 4 \ 3.72 \ 1204/1489 \ 3.72 \ 3.59 \ 4.29 \ 4.52 \ 3.72$ 4. Were special techniques successful 36 11 1 1 2 1 1 3.00 ****/1006 **** 3.68 4.00 4.21 ****

Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 52 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.08 4.19 4.40 ****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	45	Non-major	43
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	11	D	2						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		_			
				2	5						

Course Section: CHEM 437 0101 University of Maryland Title

Page 337 COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 BUSH, C. ALLEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 165

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 53 Student Course Evaluation Quest
--

					Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk		m this course	3	0	0	2	6	20	22	4.24	938/1669	4.24	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.24
_	_	ctor make clea			3	0	3	2	9	15	21		1122/1666		3.72	4.19		3.98
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions refle	ct the e	expected goals	6	0	2	2	9	17	17	3.96	1015/1421		3.49	4.24	4.38	3.96
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflec	t the ex	pected goals	4	31	1	3	1	7	6	3.78	1240/1617	3.78	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.78
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contri	bute to	what you learned	6	2	1	4	8	13	19	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00
6. Did wi	ritten as	signments cont	ribute t	o what you learned	6	32	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	723/1543	4.20	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.20
	_	g system clear		ined	6	0	0	0	8	14	25	4.36	713/1647	4.36	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.36
		was class can			6	0	0	0	0	2			357/1668		4.91		4.70	4.96
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	10	1	0	1	9	27	5	3.86	1132/1605	3.90	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.90
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectur	es well	prepared	8	0	0	0	5	13	27	4.49	830/1514	4.63	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.63
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inte	rested i	n the subject	8	0	0	0	2	7	36	4.76	880/1551	4.73	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.73
				explained clearly	8	0	0	4		20			1035/1503		3.91	4.24		4.15
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	3	5	16			1002/1506		3.80	4.26	4.29	4.26
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	4	4	10	23	4.19	483/1311	4.33	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.33
		Discu																
				what you learned	35		2	2	4	8	2	3.33	1233/1490		3.53	4.05	4.26	3.33
				ed to participate	35	0	3	1	1	9	4	3.56	1290/1502	3.56	3.84	4.26	4.46	3.56
				d open discussion		0	1	1	4	8			1204/1489		3.59	4.29		3.72
4. Were	special t	echniques succ	essful		36	11	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/1006	***	3.68	4.00	4.21	****
		Labora																
2. Were 3	you provi	ded with adequa	ate back	ground information	52	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	 0	A 17		Red	านว่า	ed fo	 or M	 la ior		0	Graduat	 e	8	Majc	 r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 14		2.00					-	-	or adda c	-	-		-	
56-83						Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 4	15	Non-	-major	43
84-150													5				3	
Grad. 8 3.50-4.00 16 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0		0.1					_		respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				3	57						
				? 5														

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title

Instructor:

TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 338 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	4	14	4.78	244/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	318/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	382/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	655/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	282/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	107/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.32
Taskinia														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.0	4 00	222/1514	4 00	1 12	4 20	4 4 5	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	-	-	-	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	307/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	17		76/1503	4.88		4.24	4.27	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.89	188/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	158/1311	4.61	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	340/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	5.00
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	49/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.76
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	144/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	25/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	81/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	4.47
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	1/	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 90			3.95	3.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	2 10	1 21	E 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal						-		3.00	, 12	****	3.∠U ****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46 ****/ 29	****	****	4.45 4.34	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Ι/	U	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	^ ^ ~	^ ^ ^ *	4.34	2.00	

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)

Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 338 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	4						

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title

Instructor:

BRIGGS, LATESEH (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18 Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 339 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	244/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	318/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	382/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	655/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	282/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1225/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4 67	****/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	1	3		1270/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1503	4.88	3.91		4.27	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1506		3.80	4.26	4.29	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1311		3.57		3.88	4.72
5. Did dadiovisual teelmiques emante your anderstanding	10	O	O	O	Ü	_	_	1.50	/1311	1.01	3.37	3.03	3.00	1.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	340/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	49/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.76
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	144/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	25/ 223		4.14	4.35	4.56	4.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	81/ 206		3.87	4.15	4.20	4.47
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearly specified	-	Ü	-	Ü	-	_	13	1.17	01/ 200	1.11	3.07	1.15	1.20	1.17
Seminar							_							
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.2U ****	4.45	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.45	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Ι/	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 29			4.34	∠.00	

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

BRIGGS, LATESEH (Instr. B)

19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 339 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	4						

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor:

OLLAND, RYAN (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Page 340 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.78	244/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	318/1421		3.49		4.38	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	382/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	655/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	282/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.63
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	2	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	591/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1506			4.26	4.29	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1311			3.85		4.72
o. Dia addiovidual commiques cimanoc four andersoanding		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	ŭ	1.00	, 1011	1.01	3.37	3.03	3.00	
Discussion	_	_		_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	340/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29		5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	49/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.76
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	144/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	25/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	81/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	4.47
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
5. Were officeria for grading made officer	- /	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	3.00	, 50			3.75	3.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: OLLAND, RYAN (Instr. C)

Enrollment:

Fall 2006

Page 340 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 18

19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	4						

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 341 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	_	0	_	0	_	1.0	4 62	440/1660	4 70	2 01	4 02	4 20	4 62
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	448/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666		3.72	4.19	4.22	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	946/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	773/1555		3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	440/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	933/1647		3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	788/1668		4.91	4.67	4.70	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	139/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	113/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1551		4.36	4.66	4.73	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	201/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	188/1506		3.80	4.26	4.29	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3		4.50	264/1311					4.50
J. Did addiovibual econniques contained your understanding	O	_	U	_	_	3		1.50	201/1311	1.01	3.37	3.03	3.00	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490		3.53	4.05	4.26	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	35/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	9		4.27	155/ 225		4.35	4.50	4.39	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	29/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.93
	2	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	150/ 206		3.87	4.15	4.20	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	۷	U	1	U	5	4	5	3.00	150/ 200	4.14	3.07	4.15	4.20	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	***	****	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
	16	0	0	0	0	0	_		, 55	****				****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	0		1		,	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	U	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 30			4.33	4.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 341 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title

Instructor: HOLEWINKSI, ROZ (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 342 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General		_	_		_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	448/1669		3.81		4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2 1	0	0	0 1	3	<i>3</i>	12 7	4.80	217/1421 946/1617		3.49 3.45	4.24 4.15	4.38	4.80 4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.13	773/1555	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	440/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2		4.87	788/1668		4.91	4.67	4.70	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	6	8	0	3.57	1325/1605			4.07		3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	3	2	0		1501/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	1	0	1	0		****/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	35/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 233		4.08	4.19	4.40	4.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	155/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	29/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	150/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	3.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16 16	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Τ6	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	^^^^/ 98	^^^		3.95	3.86	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: HOLEWINKSI, ROZ (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 342 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

20

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: Questionnaires: 17

Enrollment:

HU, GRUOZHANG (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 343 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	448/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	946/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	773/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	440/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4		4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2			788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	2	9	2	0	3.00	1501/1605	4.05		4.07	4.16	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	35/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.93
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	155/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	29/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	150/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	3.80
Seminar		_	_		_	_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
T' 11 T 1														
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	^	^	1	F 00	**** / FO	****	2 00	4 00	2 04	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	-	0	0	•	1	5.00	****/ 52		4.00	4.06	3.80	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.40	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.2U ****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.45	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	2.00	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	10	U	J	J	J	J	_	5.00	/ 29			1.57	2.00	

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: HU, GRUOZHANG (Instr. C)

Fall 2006

Page 343 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 451 0101 University of Maryland Title MECH OF ORGANIC REACTI Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 24

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 344

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	590/1669	4.50	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	17	4.54	505/1666	4.54	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	441/1421	4.63	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	156/1617	4.82	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	550/1555	4.27	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	362/1543	4.53	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	2	1	16	4.43	617/1647	4.43	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	448/1605	4.45	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	325/1514	4.83	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	460/1551	4.91	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	451/1503	4.62	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	446/1506	4.68	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1311	****	3.57	3.85	3.88	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	818/1502	4.33	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	613/1489	4.58	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	0	1	1	2		****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****
-														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 451H 0101 University of Maryland Page 345 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 MECHANISMS OF ORGANIC Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L

3

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	3.81	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	3.72	4.19	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.49	4.24	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1617	4.33	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	580/1543	4.33	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.13	4.39	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.36	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	3.91	4.24	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	3.80	4.26	4.29	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
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	1
				P	0	HICCCIVED		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Course Section: CHEM 457 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 TOTAL SYN NAT PRODUCTS

Fall 2006

Page 346

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101		Genera w insights,ski		n this source	2	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	769/1669	4.38	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.38
		ctor make clear			1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	922/1666	4.22	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.30
		estions reflec			3	0	1	0	0	4	2		1089/1421		3.49	4.19	4.22	3.86
		ations reflect			2	0	1	0	1	2	4		1009/1421	4.00	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.00
			-	what you learned	2	2	1	0	3	1	1		1395/1555		3.45	4.15	4.22	3.17
	_	_		what you learned what you learned	2	2	1	0	1	1	7		1076/1543		3.48	4.06	4.18	3.83
		g system clearl		-	2	0	1	1	0	2	<i>3</i>		1187/1647		3.40	4.12	4.16	3.88
		was class canc		rnea	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	4.75	4.91	4.12	4.70	4.75
	_				3	0	0	1	0	1	-							
9. HOW WOL	uia you s	grade the overa	II teaci	ning effectiveness	3	U	U	Τ	U	Τ	5	4.43	473/1605	4.43	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.43
		Lectur	٩															
1 Were th	he instri	actor's lecture		renared	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4 25	1082/1514	4.25	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.25
		ctor seem inter	-		2	0	0	1	0	0	7		1083/1551	4.63	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.63
					2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	879/1503		3.91	4.24	4.27	4.25
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	1	0	1	1	5		1010/1506		3.80	4.26	4.29	4.13
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				2	0	2	0	1	1	4		875/1311					3.63
5. Did aud	uiovisuai	t teciniiques en	nance yo	our understanding	۷	U	2	U	Τ	Т	4	3.03	0/3/1311	3.03	3.57	3.05	3.00	3.03
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.26	****
				d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.46	****
		-	_	d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.52	****
		echniques succe		a open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****
i. Were bi	peciai ec	comingues succe	DDIGI			Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	O	1.00	7 1000		3.00	1.00	1.21	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtio	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00 27											 -		Graduat		0			2
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 1 B 5		кес	darre	a I	or Ma	LJOES	•	0	Graduati	=	0	Majo	,T	2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Cor	nera					1	Under-q	rad 1	0	Mon	major	8
84-150	3	3.00-2.99	2	D 0		Gei	nera.	-				т	under-g.	Lau I	U	MOII-	ıııa Jor	0
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0				. רים	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Moona +	horo o	ro not	onous	rh	
Grau.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0				E16	=CL1/	<i>'</i> = 5				U	respons				_	111	
						O+1	h 0.30					6	respons	es co L	e sign	ııııcan	. L	
	I 0					Oti	her					6						
	? 0																	

University of Maryland Course Section: CHEM 457H 0101 Title Baltimore County

Page 347 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH

Questionnaires:	2	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---------------	--------------	---------------

Enrollment:

2

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	590/1669	4.50	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.48	4.06	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.70	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.13	4.39	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.36	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.57	3.85	3.88	5.00

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Title TOXICOLOGICAL CHEMISTR

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 348 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General			_		_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	556/1669	4.53	3.81		4.39	4.53
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	0	10 1	5 14	4.33	777/1666 106/1421	4.33 4.93	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.33 4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	641/1617	4.40	3.49	4.24 4.15	4.38	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	8	6	4.40	611/1555	4.40	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	516/1543	4.40	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	5		1196/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	551/1605	4.36	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.79	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.36	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	777/1503	4.36		4.24	4.27	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	313/1506	4.79	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	791/1311	3.75	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.26	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	***	3.68	4.00	4.21	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.56	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****

Title TOXICOLOGICAL CHEMISTR

Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 348 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course Section: CHEM 490A 0101 University of Maryland OPTICAL SPECTROSCOPY Baltimore County Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN

Title

Grad.

3

3.50-4.00 0

Page 349 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	Dept UMBC Leve		Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.80
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	691/1666	4.40	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.40
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	683/1421	4.40	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.40
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1425/1617	3.40	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.40
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.80
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	651/1647	4.40	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.40
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.60	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.60
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.80
				explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	932/1503	4.20	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.20
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	547/1506	4.60	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.60
				your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	995/1311	3.40	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.40
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.84	4.26	4.46	5.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	n									
TIC.																		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 0					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduate	e	3	Majo	 or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera:	L				5	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	0
84-150													_				-	

Electives

Other

0

0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

0

0

I

Course Section: CHEM 490B 0101 University of Maryland Title QUANTUM CHEM/SPECTROSC

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 350

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GREGURICK, SUSA Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				s		Instructor		Course Dept		pt UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	3.81	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.75	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.50	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1617	4.33	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1555	4.33	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.48	4.06	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	5.00	3.76	4.07	4.16	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1503	4.50	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506	4.50	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.57	3.85	3.88	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.53	4.05	4.26	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.84	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.59	4.29	4.52	5.00

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