TEM 101 0101 University of Maryland

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

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 43

CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A) Fall 2

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 240 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	5	8	24	6	3.72	1391/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	6	8	22	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	9	14	15	2		1310/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	5	12	15	3		1421/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	1	10	12	7		986/1533	3.62	3.69		3.87	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	3	8	8			1383/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	8	12			1119/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	6		4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	13	16	4	3.63	1288/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.64
T														
Lecture	0	0	^	0	2	11	0.0	4 60	721 /1560	4 20	4 12	4 42	4 20	4 42
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0 0	0	0 2	3 2	11	29	4.60	731/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	2 5	14 23	25		1289/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.36 3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5 5	23 19	16		1173/1564 1079/1559	3.97 3.93	3.90 3.79	4.28 4.29	4.20 4.20	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	5	2	6	15			928/1352		3.60			3.48
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	1	5	4	0	13	14	3.74	920/1352	3.71	3.00	3.90	3.00	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	7	7	16	1	2.83	1311/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	8	10	8	10		1259/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	9	2	19	7	3		1323/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	5	5	8	11			763/ 948	3.43			3.75	
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	4	2	3	3	1	2.62	238/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	7	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	5	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar		_												
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	7	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	4 5	1	0 1	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	5	U	Τ	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 288	^ ^ ^ ^	3.83	3.68	3.54	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	0	2	3	0	2 44	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	2	1	4	2	0		****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	4	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 39	****	5.02	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	5	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	7	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68		****
J. Did conferences neip you carry out freid accivities	33	,	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 312		4.30	3.00	3.51	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	1	0	2	4	1		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	3	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	1	2	3	1		****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	1	0	3	1			****/ 110			3.99		***
		_	_	-	-	_	_		,					

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 43

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 240 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	23	-		_	
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 59 Questionnaires: 43

## Ctudent Course Evaluation Overtionnein

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 241 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnal	.re
---------------------------------------	-----

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	5	8	24	6	3.72	1391/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	6	8	22	6		1408/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	9	14	15	2	3.14	1310/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	5	12	15	3	3.46	1421/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	1	10	12	7	3.83	986/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	3	8	8	1	3.24	1383/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	8	12	15	3.95	1119/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	6	31	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	3	7	16	6	1	2.85	1547/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	4	15	16	4.08	1248/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	2	5	12	20	4.20	1419/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	6	3	8	13	7		1443/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	7	10	12	3		1476/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	6	2	13	7	5	3.09	1208/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	7	7	16	1		1311/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	8	10	8	10		1259/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	9	2	19	7	3		1323/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	5	5	8	11	9	3.37	763/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.37
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	4	2	3	3	1	2.62	238/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	7	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	5	3	1	0	1	1		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	7	0	0	1	1	0	0.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34 33	4 5	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	5	U	Τ	Τ	3	U	3.40	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.54	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	0	2	3	0		****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	2	1	4	2	0		****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	4	0	1	0	4	0		****/ 39	***	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	5	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	* * * *
Self Paced		_			_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	3	0	1	0	4	0			3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1 1	0	1	2	3 1	1 2	3.57	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	T	1	U	3	Τ	2	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 43

59

Page 241 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
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 si	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	23	-			
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 59 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 242 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	5	8	24	6	3.72	1391/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	6	8	22	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	9	14	15	2		1310/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	5	12	15	3		1421/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	1	10	12	7		986/1533	3.62	3.69		3.87	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	3	8	8	1		1383/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	8	12			1119/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	6	31	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	8	14	9	4.03	897/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.64
T a whoma														
Lecture	1 4	0	^	0	2	0	1.0	4 50	020/1560	4 20	4 12	4 42	4 20	4 42
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0 0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	839/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11 11	0	1	0	<i>3</i>	14 12	15 13		1339/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.36 3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	1	8	13	13 7		1064/1564 1246/1559	3.97 3.93	3.90 3.79	4.28 4.29	4.20 4.20	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	3	3	4	13	7		1039/1352		3.60			3.48
5. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	13	5	3	3	4	0	,	3.32	1039/1352	3.71	3.00	3.90	3.00	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	7	7	16	1	2.83	1311/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	8	10	8	10		1259/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	9	2	19	7	3		1323/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	5	5	8	11	9	3.37	763/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.37
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	8	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	4	2	3	3	1	2.62	238/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	7	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	5	3	1	0	1	1		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar	2.2	0	^	0	2	4	1	2 75	****/ OO	4444	4 22	4 54	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	3	4	Ţ		****/ 88 ****/ 85	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
<ol> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	34 34	6 7	0	1	1 1	1 1	0	3.00	,	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	4	1	0	1	3	0		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	5.00 4.50	4.43	4.39 4.01	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	5	0	1	1	3	0		****/ 288	****	3.83		3.54	***
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	55	5	U			J	U	3.40	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	0	2	3	0	2.44	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	2	1	4	2	0		****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	4	0	1	0	4	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	5	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	7	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68		****
1. 11. Sometimes mary for early out field desivities	23	,	J	J	_	J	J	2.00	, 512		1.50	2.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	1	0	2	4	1			3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	3	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 43

Title

MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. C)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 242 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons	Reasons Type					
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	23	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Enrollment:

DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. D)

Ouestionnaires: 43

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 243

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 5 8 24 6 3.72 1391/1649 3.77 3.96 4.28 4.11 3.72 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 6 8 22 6 3.67 1408/1648 3.67 3.88 4.23 4.16 3.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 2 9 14 15 2 3.14 1310/1375 3.30 3.57 4.27 4.10 3.14 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 5 12 15 3 3.46 1421/1595 3.38 3.74 4.20 4.03 3.46 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 7 0 1 10 12 7 3.83 986/1533 3.62 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 18 1 3 8 8 1 3.24 1383/1512 3.41 3.72 4.10 3.86 3.24 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
R How many times was class cancelled 4 0 1 3 8 12 15 3.95 1119/1623 3.84 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.95 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 1 0 6 31 4.76 897/1646 4.76 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.76 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 1 0 0 8 14 9 4.03 897/1621 3.70 3.64 4.06 3.96 3.64 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 0 Ω 3 8 18 4.52 839/1568 4.32 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.43 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 0 0 3 13 16 4.41 1321/1572 4.40 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.36 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0 1 0 6 10 15 4.19 1010/1564 3.97 3.90 4.28 4.20 3.90 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 9 12 8 3.87 1216/1559 3.93 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.70 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 5 3 2 5 8 7 3.56 1020/1352 3.71 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.48 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 9 7 16 1 2.83 1311/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.86 2.83 10 3.30 1259/1382 3.66 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.30 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 8 10 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 9 2 19 7 3 2.83 1323/1368 3.43 3.63 4.30 4.01 2.83 4. Were special techniques successful 3 2 5 5 8 11 9 3.37 763/ 948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.37 Laboratory 0 2.50 \*\*\*\*/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 \*\*\*\* 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 27 8 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 4 2 3 3 1 2.62 238/243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.62 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 7 1 0 0 3 0 3.25 \*\*\*\* 212 \*\*\*\* 4.30 4.40 4.43 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 32 5 3 1 0 1 1 2.33 \*\*\*\* 209 \*\*\*\* 4.25 4.35 4.38 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 32 7 0 1 0 3 0 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.09 4.29 4.14 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1 3.75 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.54 4.31 \*\*\*\* 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.30 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 34 6 1 1 1 34 7 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.43 4.39 \*\*\*\* 34 4 1 0 1 3 0 3.20 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.35 4.01 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 33 5 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 \*\*\*\* 288 \*\*\*\* 3.83 3.68 3.54 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 34 0 4 0 2 3 0 2.44 \*\*\*\*/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 34 0 2 1 4 2 0 2.67 \*\*\*\* 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 34 4 0 1 0 4 0 3.60 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.36 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  $35 \quad 5 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 3.67 \, **** / \, 39 \quad **** \quad 5.00 \quad 4.38 \quad 4.37 \quad ****$ 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35 7 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 312 \*\*\*\* 4.38 3.68 3.51 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35 0 0 1 4 3 0 3.25 \*\*\*\*/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  $$\tt 35\tt 0\tt 1$ 0 2 4 1 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 35 3 0 1 0 4 0 3.60 \*\*\*\*/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 \*\*\*\*

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 35 1 0 1 2 3 1 3.57 \*\*\*\*/ 24 3.76 4.18 4.42 4.24 \*\*\*\*

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 35 1 1 0 3 1 2 3.43 \*\*\*\*/ 110 3.24 3.82 3.99 3.83 \*\*\*\*

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 59

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 243 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 43 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	23	-		_	
				?	0						

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

Enrollment: 72

Questionnaires: 60

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 244 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	_			_										
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	2	3	11	28	10		1376/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	2	1 3	3 9	17	23 21	10		1382/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6 6	11	4	4	11 14	$\frac{21}{14}$	8 7		1236/1375 1456/1595	3.30	3.57 3.74	4.27	4.10 4.03	3.42 3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	815/1533	3.62	3.69	4.20	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	0	11	10	10		1101/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	5	7	19	22	4.09	984/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	1	7	43	4.72	977/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	1	0	1	5	11	9	4.08	875/1621	3.70			3.96	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	3	11	35	4.60	731/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	3	13	32		1193/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	3	6	17	22	4.21	992/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	2	3	2	12	27	4.28	945/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	3	2	6	9	23	4.09	638/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	5	5	17	12		1043/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	4	6	14	15		1104/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17 17	0	2 7	3	8 5	15	15		1039/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30		3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1./	4	/	0	5	14	13	3.67	645/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	3	1	4	2	2		****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	3	0	3	4		****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	3	1	0	0	2	6		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	3 4	1 1	1	1	2	5 5		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	Ţ	1	U	2	5	4.00	****/ 555	***	4.09	4.29	4.14	
Seminar		_	_	_	_						4 00			
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	2	1	1	3	2	5.22	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50 52	2	4 1	0 1	0	3 1	1 2		****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	5.00	4.47 4.43	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	0	1	2	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	1	0	2	1	2		****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
• •	32	۷	1	U	2	1	2	3.30	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.31	
Field Work				_		_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	2	0	3	1		****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	2	1	1	2	1		****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	2	0	1	1 1	2		****/ 39 ****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53 53	4	1 1	1	0	1	2 1		****/ 39 ****/ 312	****	5.00 4.38	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	1	U	U	1	Τ.	3.33	/ 312		4.30	3.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	1	0	2	3		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	2	1	0	0	2	2		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	1	0	0	2	2		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	1	0	0	1	3		****/ 24 ****/ 110	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	Т	1	U	1	2	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 60

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 244 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	dits Earned Cum. GPA			Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0			
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60			
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	h			
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant				
				I	0	Other	11	_						
				?	0									

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor:

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 60

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 245 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	2	3	11	28	10	3.76	1376/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	3	17	23	10	3.70	1382/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	3	9	11	21	8	3.42	1236/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	11	4	4	14	14	7	3.37	1456/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	815/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	0	11	10	10	3.79	1101/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	5	7	19	22	4.09	984/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	1	7	43		977/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	0	1	1	11	10	0	3.30	1440/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	7	11	21	4.36	1031/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	1	1	4	12	22	4.32	1371/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	1	5	16	14	4.03	1118/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	5	1	5	11	13	3.74	1283/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	8	0	1	6	9	10	4.08	650/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	5	5	17	12	3.59	1043/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	4	6	14	15	3.74	1104/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	3	8	15	15	3.88	1039/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	7	0	5	14	13	3.67	645/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	3	1	0	0	2	6	4.33		****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	3	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	4	0	0	3	1	2.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80		3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 60

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 245 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	ned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

Baltimore County DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C) Fall 2008

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 246

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	2	3	11	28	10	3.76	1376/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	3	17	23	10	3.70	1382/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	3	9	11	21	8		1236/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	11	4	4	14	14	7		1456/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	815/1533		3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	0	11	10	10		1101/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	5	7	19	22	4.09	984/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	1	7	43	4.72	,	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	0	0	0	7	8	5	3.90	1060/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	6	8	1 2	1 11	1205/1560	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32 29	0	1	1	5	9	13 15		1205/1568 1429/1572	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	2	5	9	12		1083/1564			4.70	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	2	3	4	7	9		1295/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	4	0	5	3	4	10	3.86	842/1352		3.60	3.98	3.86	4.01
J. Did additivisual techniques emhance your understanding	21	-	U	J	5	-	10	3.00	042/1332	3.71	3.00	3.70	3.00	1.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	5	5	17	12	3.59	1043/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	4	6	14	15		1104/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	3	8	15	15		1039/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	7	0	5	14	13	3.67	645/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	3	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	3	1	1	1	2	5		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar	- 0	-	0	-	-	2	0	2 00	****	als als als als	4 22	4 = 4	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	2	1	1	3	2	5.22	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50 52	2	4 1	0 1	0	3 1	1 2	2.63	****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52 52	3	1	0	1	2	1		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	5.00 4.50	4.43 4.35	4.39 4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	1	0	2	1	2		****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.54	***
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	22	2		U	2		2	3.30	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	2	0	1	1	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	1	1	0	1	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
• • •									•					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	1	0	0	2	2		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 60

Title

MARGARET (Instr. C) Fall 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 246 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-		_	
				?	0						

M 101 0102 University of Maryland

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 60

JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D) Fall 20

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 247 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	que	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	2	3	11	28	10		1376/1649		3.96	4.28	4.11	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	3	17	23	10		1382/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	3	9	11	21	8		1236/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	11	4	4	14	14	7		1456/1595		3.74	4.20		3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	12	0	2	12	11	16	4.00	815/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	0	11	10	10		1101/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	5	7	19	22	4.09		3.84	3.84	4.16		4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	2	1	7	43				4.83	4.69	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	0	1	2	6	8	3	3.50	1345/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70
T a whom														
Lecture	2.0	0	2	1	4	0	1 2	1 0 1	1065/1560	4 20	1 12	1 12	4 20	4.28
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32 29	0	1	2	4	8 9	13 15		1265/1568 1442/1572		4.13 4.23	4.43	4.39	
<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> </ol>		0	1		4		15		1282/1564		3.90	4.70 4.28	4.64	4.29
	32 34		4	4 2	3	10 7	9						4.20	4.03 3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1 5	0	4	2	5		4.00	1344/1559		3.79	4.29	4.20	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	5	U	4	2	Э	10	4.00	690/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	5	5	17	12	3.59	1043/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	4	6	14	15		1104/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	3	8	15	15	3.88	1039/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	7	0	5	14	13		645/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95		3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	2	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	3	1	0	0	2	6		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	3	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	4	0	0	3	1	2.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	1	0	1	2		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	3	1	0	1	2	1		,	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	2	1	0	2	1	2		****/ 288		3.83	3.68	3.54	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	52	2	_	O		_		3.30	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	1	0	2	3		****/ 53		3.70	4.30		****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00			4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 72

Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 247

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	its Earned Cum. GPA			arned Cum. GPA Expecte				Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0			
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60			
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	h			
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant				
				I	0	Other	11	_						
				?	0									

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103 Title

University of Maryland

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

72 Questionnaires: 60

Enrollment:

Page 248 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	20116	ncie	g		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	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	4	2	11	26	17	3.83	1327/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	26	11	3.68	1395/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	21	16	8	3.22	1290/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	8	10	15	7	3.35	1467/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	7	14	15	13	3.59	1193/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	4	10	11	8	3.54	1240/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	15	18	17	3.72	1287/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	2	0	0	5	50	4.77	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	2	0	14	18	6	3.65	1268/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	14			715/1568			4.43	4.39	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	15	41		1096/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	10		18		1122/1564	3.97		4.28	4.20	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	12	19	22		1189/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	5	1	13	18	20	3.82	866/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	13	18	17	3.78	948/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	6	12	15	20		1092/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	9	16		1215/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	10	6	8	10			713/ 948	3.43		3.95	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successiui	4	_	10	O	0	10	21	3.47	713/ 940	3.43	3.30	3.93	3.75	3.47
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 212	***	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 209	***	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 88	***	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	***	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 312	****	4 38	3.68	3.51	****
J. Did conferences help you early out freta activities	ر ر	U	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	/ 314		1.50	5.00	J.J±	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Questionnaires: 60

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 248 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment: 72

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 249 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 60 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quantitative and			Fr	-0116	ncie	S		Tngt	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	11	26	17	3.83	1327/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	26	11	3.68	1395/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	21	16	8	3.22	1290/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	8	10	15	7	3.35	1467/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	7	14	15	13	3.59	1193/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	4	10	11	8	3.54	1240/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	15	18	17	3.72	1287/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	2	0	0	5	50	4.77	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	1	2	25	7	2	3.19	1468/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	6	7	8	20	4.02	1270/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	4	3	10	24	4.32	1377/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	3	10	16	9	3.67	1332/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	3	3	2	9	9	12	3.71	1301/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	7	5	2	9	8	9	3.42	1090/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	13	18	17	3.78	948/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	6	12	15	20	3.77	1092/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	9	16	3.38	1215/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	10	6	8	10	21	3.47	713/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.47
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	5	1	1	1	1	0		****/ 221			4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	2	0	3	1	1		****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	1	0	2		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar						_					4 00		4 0 4	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
miald mani-														
Field Work	гο	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 312	****	4 20	2 (0	2 [1	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	U	U	U	U	Т	0	4.00	***/ 312		4.38	3.68	3.51	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 30	3.58	3.70	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41		4.04	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 110		3.82		3.83	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	رر	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	, 110	J. 4T	3.02	3.99	٠.٥٥	

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 60

Title

72

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 249 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35	_		_	
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 60

72

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 250 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR 	NA 	Fre 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	11	26	17	3.83	1327/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	26	11	3.68	1395/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	21	16	8	3.22	1290/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	8	10	15	7	3.35	1467/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	7	14	15	13	3.59	1193/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	4	10	11	8	3.54	1240/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	15	18	17	3.72	1287/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	2	0	0	5	50	4.77	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	0	1	2	13	21	4.46	442/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	517/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	1	1	6	31	4.72	1003/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	0	1	14	21	4.46	715/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	1	2	9	21	4.41	818/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	7	1	2	4	4	15	4.15	590/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	13	18	17	3.78	948/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	6	12	15	20		1092/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	9	16		1215/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	10	6	8	10	21		713/ 948		3.50	3.95		3.47
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	2	0	3	1	1		****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	1	0	2		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	1	1	1	2		****/ 555	***	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	1	0	3 50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	****		3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
nale Darad														
Self Paced	Ε0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 02	++++/>	2 05	2 70	4 20	1 17	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	•	1	0	0	0		****/ 53 ****/ 20	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 60

nstr. C)

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

## Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35	_			
				?	1						

Page 250 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 251 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	11	26	17	3.83	1327/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	26	11	3.68	1395/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	21	16	8	3.22	1290/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	8	10	15	7	3.35	1467/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	7	14	15	13	3.59	1193/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	2	4	10	11	8	3.54	1240/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	15	18	17	3.72	1287/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	2	0	0	5	50	4.77	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	0	1	5	16	14	4.19	754/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	3	5	26	4.68	620/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	1	1	5	32	4.74	949/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	1	1	14	20	4.38	812/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	2	0	2	10	21	4.37	861/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	7	1	1	4	5	15	4.23	528/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	5	13	18	17	3.78	948/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	6	12	15	20	3.77	1092/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	4	19	9	16	3.38	1215/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	10	6	8	10	21	3.47	713/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.47
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	5	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	1	0	2		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92		4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 251 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35	-		_	
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 53

### Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 252 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Ins	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	4	8	11	14	15	3.54	1489/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	17	16	13	3.64	1421/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	5	5	20	10	10	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	4	7	11	10	6	3.18	1504/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	5	6	9	9	9	3.29	1354/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	5	8	7	8	3.55	1234/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	5	17	13	14	3.68	1308/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	5	40	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	1	8	20	8	3.79	1159/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	10	6	33	4.40	983/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	3	0	4	5	37	4.49	1257/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	11	9	26	4.16	1028/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	13	5	28	4.18	1016/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	2	1	11	8	23	4.09	644/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.77
Discussion	_			_								4 00	2 25	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	12	3	8	8	14		1209/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	5	6	10	17		1170/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0 8	7 5	5 3	9 7	7	16		1193/1368		3.63	4.30	4.01	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	5	3	7	8	13	3.58	682/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
									,					
Self Paced	F 4	^	-1	^	^	-	^	0 50	****	2 25	2 50	4 20	4 15	الدائيات الت
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30 ****/	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51 51	1	0	0	0	0 1	0 T	5.00	****/ 24 ****/ 110	3.76	4.18	4.42 3.99	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	эт	Τ	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00		3.24	3.02	3.99	3.03	*

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 53 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 252 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32	-			
				?	0						

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

Instructor:

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 53 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 253 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	MD	<b>N</b> T 70	Fre	_	ncie		5		tructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NK 	NA		2 	3	4		Mean	Rank 	Mean 	Mean	Mean	mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	8	11	14	15	3.54	1489/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	17	16	13	3.64	1421/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	5	5	20	10	10	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	4	7	11	10	6	3.18	1504/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	5	6	9	9	9		1354/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	5	8	7	8		1234/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.55
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	2	1	1	5	17	13	14		1308/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	5	40	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	1	4	13	13	4	3.43	1393/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	11	6	22	4.20	1169/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	2	6	5	27	4.43	1305/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	2	11	5	20		1105/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	2	12	5	18		1201/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	3	2	11	7	13	3.69	955/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	12	3	8	8	14	3.20	1209/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	5	6	10	17	3.61	1170/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	5	9	7	16	3.45	1193/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	5	3	7	8	13	3.58	682/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced	E 1	^	1	0	0	1	0	2 50	****/ 53	2 05	2 70	4 20	1 17	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51 51	0	1 0	0	0	1	0 1	2.50 4.50	****/ 53 ****/ 30	3.05 3.58	3.70 3.72	4.30 4.16	4.17 4.06	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	3.58	3.72 4.04	4.16	4.06	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110			3.99	3.83	****
5. Here shore chough proceeds for all the settlements	91	_	J	J	J	_	J	1.00	, 110	3.21	3.02	3.22	3.03	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 253 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32	-			
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 53 Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 254 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eanse	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	8	11	14	15	3.54	1489/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	17	16	13	3.64	1421/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	5	5	20	10	10	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	4	7	11	10	6	3.18	1504/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	5	6	9	9	9	3.29	1354/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	5	8	7	8	3.55	1234/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	5	17	13	14	3.68	1308/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	5	40	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	3	14	12	5	3.56	1323/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	0	12	6	14	3.88	1354/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	2	10	7	17		1451/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	12	9			1209/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	2	3	11	5	14		1283/1559		3.79	4.29		3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	3	2	11	4			1011/1352			3.98		3.77
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	12	3	8	8	14		1209/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	5	6	10	17		1170/1382		3.84	4.29		3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	5	9	7	16		1193/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30		3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	5	3	7	8	13	3.58	682/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	***	4.09	4.29	4.14	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	***	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	***	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110		3.82	3.99	3.83	****
		_	-	-	-	_	-	,	, _10					

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72

Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 254 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32	-			
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title

Instructor:

WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 255 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	8	11	14	15	3.54	1489/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	17	16	13	3.64	1421/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	5	5	20	10	10	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	4	7	11	10	6	3.18	1504/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	5	6	9	9	9	3.29	1354/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	5	8	7	8	3.55	1234/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	5	17	13	14		1308/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	1	5	40	4.79	865/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	0	12	16	4	3.75	1192/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	2	1	10	7	15	3.91	1340/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	2	7	5	23	4.32	1371/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	2	2	8	7	19	4.03	1118/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	2	1	9	5	19		1098/1559		3.79	4.29	4.20	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	3	2	10	5	13	3.70	955/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	12	3	8	8	14	3.20	1209/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	5	6	10	17	3.61	1170/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	5	9	7	16	3.45	1193/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	5	3	7	8	13	3.58	682/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	2	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	***	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30		3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 72

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 255 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32	_		_	
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 71 Questionnaires: 46

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 256 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	encie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General														
1 Did you gain new i	nsights,skills from this course	5	0	3	0	9	16	13	3 88	1295/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.88
	make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	3	11	13	11		1340/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.77
	ions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	6	12	12	10		1153/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.65
_	ons reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	3	7	16	2		1372/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.61
	ngs contribute to what you learned	5	12	2	0	9	9	9		1026/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.79
_	ments contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	1	6	9	4	3.43	1303/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.43
	stem clearly explained	5	0	1	2	9	14	15	3.98	1074/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.98
8. How many times was	class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	945/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grad	e the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	0	0	5	17	4	3.96	972/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68
	Lecture														
	r's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	9	29	4.63		4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32
	seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	3	6	28		1146/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.41
	al presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	6	19	13		1010/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.87
	ontribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	6	10	20	4.32	911/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.01
5. Did audiovisual te	chniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	2	4	13	17	4.16	582/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73
	Discussion														
1. Did class discussi	ons contribute to what you learned	10	0	9	3	10	7	7	3.00	1254/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.00
	actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	4	9	7	14	3.68	1142/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.68
	encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	4	10	10	8		1212/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39
4. Were special techn	iques successful	9	3	11	2	5	7	9	3.03	842/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.03
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increa	se understanding of the material	32	2	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	187/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.58
	with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.38
	erials available for lab activities	33	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instru	ctor provide assistance	34	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements	for lab reports clearly specified	35	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
	Seminar														
<ol> <li>Were assigned topi</li> </ol>	cs relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
	available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
	cts contribute to what you learned	39	4	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
_	contribute to what you learned	38	3	1	0	1	1	2		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for	grading made clear	38	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
	Field Work														
1. Did field experien	ce contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly un	derstand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor	available for consultation	40	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree cou	ld you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences he	lp you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
	Self Paced														
	tem contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	4	2		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
	s make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
	with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	0	1	2	3		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
	utoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	2	2	4		****/ 24	3.76		4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough	proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Questionnaires: 46

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 256 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	22	_				
				?	1							

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor:

Enrollment: 71

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 257 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	46	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	3	0	9	16	13	3.88	1295/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	3	11	13	11	3.77	1340/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	6	12	12	10	3.65	1153/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	3	7	16	2	3.61	1372/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	2	0	9	9	9	3.79	1026/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	1	6	9	4	3.43	1303/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	9	14	15	3.98	1074/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	945/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	2	2	11	10	1	3.23	1456/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68
Lecture		•		_	_	_		4 00	1050/1560	4 00	4 4 4 6	4 40	4 00	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	2	2	7	7	17		1279/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	1	4	5	25		1289/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	4	1	10	13	6		1399/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	2	3	4	8	7	10		1362/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29		4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	4	3	7	6	9	3.45	1080/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	9	3	10	7	7	3 00	1254/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	4	9	7	14		1142/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	4	10	10	8		1212/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	11	2	5	7	9	3.03		3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.03
I Here Special Committees Successful		J		_		•		3.03	012, 310	3.13	3.30	3.75	3.75	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	187/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar		•		_		_					4 00		4 04	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	2	3		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	4	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	3	1	0	1	1	2		****/ 92	****	4.50		4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3 43	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	2	2	2		,	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	2	2	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	2	1			****/ 312	****	4.38		3.51	****
J. Dia conferences help you carry out freid activities	10	_	O	Ü	-	_	_	3.73	, 312		1.50	3.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	***

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 71
Questionnaires: 46

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 257 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

nt: 71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	-			
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 71 Questionnaires: 46

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 258 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies In			Ins	tructor	tor Course De		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	5	0	3	0	9	16	13	3.88	1295/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	3	11	13	11	3.77	1340/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	6	12	12	10	3.65	1153/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	3	7	16	2	3.61	1372/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	2	0	9	9	9	3.79	1026/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	1	6	9	4	3.43	1303/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	9	14	15	3.98	1074/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73	945/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	2	7	15	2	3.65	1268/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	6	5	16	4.29	1096/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	2	4	11	15	4.22	1412/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	2	8	12	9	3.81	1267/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	6	8	12	4.07	1088/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	1	4	6	3	9	3.65	976/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	9	3	10	7	7	3.00	1254/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	4	9	7	14	3.68	1142/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	4	10	10	8	3.39	1212/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	11	2	5	7	9	3.03	842/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	187/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	3	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 71 Questionnaires: 46 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 258 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	22	-			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 46

71

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 259 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetion	$n \circ i \circ n \circ a$

Questions			Fre	eque 2	ncie	es 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	3	0	9	16	13	2 00	1295/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5 7	0	1	3	11	13	11		1340/1648		3.88	4.23	4.11	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	6	12	12	10		1153/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	3	7	16	2		1372/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	2	0	9	9	9		1026/1533		3.69	4.04	3.87	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	18	3	1	6	9	4		1303/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	9	14	15		1074/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	33	4.73			4.83	4.69		4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	2	3	17	4	3.88	1078/1621					3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	5	5	17		1031/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	7	7	19		, -		4.23	4.70	4.64	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	2	6	13	10		1127/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	6	8	13		1075/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	4	1	4	6	3	9	3.65	976/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73
Discussion	1.0	^	^	2	1.0	-	-	2 00	1054/1004	2 40	2 50	4 00	2 26	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	9	3	10	7	7		1254/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3 4	4	9 10	7 10	14 8		1142/1382		3.84	4.29	4.03	3.68 3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	10 9	3	11	4	5	7	9		1212/1368 842/ 948		3.63 3.50	4.30 3.95	4.01 3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	11	4	5	,	9	3.03	044/ 940	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	187/ 221		4.14	4.16	4.05	3.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	3	0	1	1	1	7			****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	2	1	0	2	3	4		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4 60	****		4 22	4 5 4	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38 39	3 4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	5.00 5.00	4.47 4.43	4.30 4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	, -		4.50	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	1	0	1	1	3		****/ 288		3.83	3.68	3.54	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	2	2		,	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	0	0	2	1	1		****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 30		3.72	4.16	4.06	****
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		2	0	0	1	2	3				4.04	4.43	4.27	****
. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 24		4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students			0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	***

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 46 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 259 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	0 #### - Means there a		are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	_			
				?	1						

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

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 54

Page 260 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			00011	-1
	F	all	2008	
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Frequencies		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	5	10	17	21	3.96	1218/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	9	23	15	3.85	1271/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	6	13	18	9	3.26	1281/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	9	14	12	3.85	1236/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	11	10	18	3.80	1017/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	8	11	7	3.85	1055/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	8	15	11	20	3.80	1246/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled		1	0	1	1	6	44	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	3	13	19	7	3.71	1225/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	10	39	4.66	636/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	7	42	4.69	1046/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	6	9	15	22	3.91	1219/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		1	2	4	10	12	25	4.02	1116/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	7	4	11	11	19	3.60	1006/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	16	6	18		1105/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	5	11	11	18		1183/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	10	6	9	7	18		1225/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	9	8	7	14	3.32	784/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32
- 1														
Laboratory		_	_	•			_						4 0=	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	6	2	0	1	3	5		****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	2	1	4	4		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	3	4	4		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	6	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	0	0	1	2	4	1 12	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	,	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	4	0	2	2	0	2		****/ 288	****		3.68	3.54	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	11	-	U	2	2	U	2	3.33	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	0	4	0	1	2 50	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	2	1	4	0	1		****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	4	0	1	1	1	3		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	4	0	1	2	0	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	4	0	1	3	2	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
J. Dia conferences neip you carry out freid activities	11	1	J	_	J	2	J	5.11	, 512		1.50	5.00	J.JI	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	3	0	0	1	4	2		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	2	1	3	1		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	3	0	0	2	2	3		****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	3	0	2	1	3			****/ 110		3.82		3.83	****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	-	-	_	_	-	_		,					

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 260 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0 #### - Means there		there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B) Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 54

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 261

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	17	21	3.96	1218/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	9	23	15		1271/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	6	13	18	9		1281/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	9	14	12	3.85	1236/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	11	10	18	3.80	1017/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	8	11	7	3.85	1055/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	8	15	11	20	3.80	1246/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	44	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	3	6	18	10	2	3.05	1496/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	4	9	24	4.45	930/1568		4.13	4.43	4.39	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	2	6	6	26		1377/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	3	12	11	11		1306/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	2	5	9	6	15		1295/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	13	2	4	5	11	2.97	1230/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	16	6	18		1105/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	5	11	11	18		1183/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	10	6	9	7	18		1225/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	9	8	7	14	3.32	784/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	6	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	3	4	4		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	6	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/ 555	***	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	, -	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	4	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	0	4	0	1		****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	4	0	1	1	1	3		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60		****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	4	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	1	1	4	1		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	3	0	0	1	4	2		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	2	1	3	1		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	3	0	0	2	2	3		****/ 24		4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 261 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0 #### - Means there		there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37	_			
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 54

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 262 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	-0116	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_	_										
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	17	21		1218/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	7	9	23	15		1271/1648		3.88	4.23	4.16	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	6	13	18	9		1281/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	9	14	12		1236/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	11	10	18		1017/1533		3.69	4.04	3.87	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	8	11	7		1055/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	8	15	11	20		1246/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	44		865/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	1	10	20	6	3.84	1123/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	2	1	4	7	16	4.13	1213/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	7	8	21		1333/1572		4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	1	8	9	12		1163/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	3	5	6	13		1151/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	5	1	5	3			1049/1352			3.98		3.36
or bid dadrovibadi besimilyass cimanos jour anderstanding		-	J	_				3.30	1019,1332	3.71	3.00	3.70	3.00	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	16	6	18	3.44	1105/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	5	11	11	18	3.59	1183/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	10	6	9	7	18	3.34	1225/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	9	8	7	14	3.32	784/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	6	2	0	1	3	5	3 83	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	4	4	4			3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	2	1	4	4		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	3	4	4			****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	6	0	1	2	2	4		****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatly specified	33	U	U		2	2	-	1.00	/ 333		4.00	1.27	7,17	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80		****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	4	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	0	4	0	1	2.50	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63		2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	4	0	1	1	1	3		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	,	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	4	0	1	3	2	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
1 tomotomoss note 100 carry out richa accryticies		-	0	_	5	_	0	J. ± /	, 512		1.50	3.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	1	1	4	1		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	2	1	3	1		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	3	0	0	2	2	3		****/ 24		4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 262 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37	-			
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Instructor: Enrollment:

60

Questionnaires: 54

Page 263

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
. ,														
General	0	0	1	5	10	17	01	2 06	1218/1649	2 77	2 06	4 20	4.11	3.96
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	0	5 7	9	23	21 15		1218/1649	3.77 3.67	3.96 3.88	4.28	4.11	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	6	13	18	9		1281/1375	3.30	3.57	4.23	4.10	3.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	9	14			1236/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.10	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	11	10	18		1017/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	8	11	7		1055/1512	3.41		4.10	3.86	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	8	15	11	20		1246/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	44		865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	11	18			1151/1621		3.64	4.06	3.96	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	0	6	5	16		1213/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	1	6	8	19		1409/1572		4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	2	8	7			1191/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	3	6	6	12		1201/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	6	1	5	2	10	3.38	1113/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	16	6	18		1105/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	5	11	11	18		1183/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0 7	10 6	6	9	7			1225/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	6	9	8	7	14	3.32	784/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	6	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	2	1	4	4		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	0	0	3	4	4		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	6	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar					_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	8	0	0	1	2	4		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
<ol> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	44 44	5 5	0	1	1 1	1 1	2		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5 4	0	2	2	0	2		****/ 288	****	4.50 3.83	4.35 3.68	4.01 3.54	****
5. Were Criteria for grading made Crear	44	4	U	۷	۷	U	۷	3.33	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.34	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	0	4	0	1		****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	2	1	4	0	1		****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	4	0	1	1	1	3		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	4	0	1	2	0	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	4	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	1	1	4	1		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	3	0	0	1	4	2		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	3	0	2	1	3	1		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment:

MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Fall 2008

Page 263 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 54

60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37	_			
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

72 Questionnaires: 63

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 264 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	3	16	25	15	3.74	1381/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	28	9	3.48	1490/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	12	17	16	8		1323/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	6	15	22	6		1435/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	9	21	13	13		1255/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	8	4	13	10	3		1460/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	2.89
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	2	0	3	5	13	19	21		1234/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	12	47		913/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	2	1	10	23	11	3.85	1105/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.82
T a whom														
Lecture	_	0	0	1	7	1.0	41	4 42	056/1560	4 20	4 12	4 42	4 20	4 22
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	-	2	1		10	41	4.43	956/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	2	0	9	9	41		1305/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3 2	13 13	23	19		1246/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	3 6	∠ 5	13 7	17	26		1121/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	6	5	7	20	20	3.74	921/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	9	12	19	12	3 30	1175/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	16	24	15		1080/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	2	17	22	13		1140/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	7	5	13				727/ 948			3.95	3.75	3.44
1. Were special techniques successful	3	O	,	5	13	13		3.11	7277 510	3.13	3.30	3.75	3.73	3.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	11	2	1	8	1	3	3.13	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	6	1	6	4	2	2.74	229/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.74
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	6	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	6	1	1	7	3	2	3.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	11	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	9	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	10	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	10	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	8	0	1	4	5	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	7	0	6	2	1		46/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	2.38
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	6	1	6	3	1	2.53	47/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	2.53
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	7	0	3	2	3	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	8	0	1	7	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	8	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Colf. Down														
Self Paced	17	^	4	2	_	_	2	2 05	40/ 53	2 05	2 70	4 20	4 10	2 05
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	3	6	6	3	3.05	48/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	3.05
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	3	0	2	8	5	4		24/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	3.58
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	5	1	2	5 7	3		3.56	36/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	3.56
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	5	0	1	-	4	5	3.76	20/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	3.76
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	103/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	3.24

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 63 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 264 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35	_		_	
				?	0						

EM 101 0202

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMI Enrollment: 72

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B) 72

Questionnaires: 63

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 265 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse!	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------	--------	------------	---------------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	es 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	3	3	16	25	15	3 74	1381/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	28	9		1490/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	12	17	16	8		1323/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	-6	15	22	6		1435/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	9	21	13	13		1255/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	8	4	13	10	3	2.89	1460/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	13	19	21	3.82	1234/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	12	47	4.75	913/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	4	7	16	11	3	3.05	1497/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	2	5	9	12	23		1306/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	2	8	15	25		1419/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	7	8	9	17	9		1457/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	7	6	10	15	11		1422/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	7	4	12	14	9	3.30	1143/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.67
Discussion	_	•							4455/4004			4 00		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	9	12	19	12		1175/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	16	24	15		1080/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0 6	5 7	2 5	17 13	22	13		1140/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	/	5	13	15	14	3.44	727/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.44
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	11	2	1	8	1	3	3.13	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	6	1	6	4	2	2.74	229/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.74
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	6	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	6	1	1	7	3	2		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	11	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	9	0	1	4	4	4		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	10	0	1	3	2	2		****/ 85	***	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
<ol> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	45 44	10 8	0	1 1	3 4	3 5	1 1		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5	0	2	4	5 5	3		****/ 288	****	4.50 3.83	4.35	4.01 3.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	44	5	U	۷	4	5	3	3.04	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.34	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	7	0	6	2	1	2.38	46/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	2.38
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	6	1	6	3	1	2.53	47/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	2.53
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	7	0	3	2	3	2	3.10	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	8	0	1	7	0	1	3.11	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	8	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	3	6	6	3	3.05	48/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	3.05
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	3	0	2	8	5	4	3.58	24/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	3.58
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	5	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	36/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	3.56
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	5	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	20/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	3.76
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	103/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	3.24

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 63

Title

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 265

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 63

GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 266 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eval	uation	Questio	onnaire
---------	--------	------	--------	---------	---------

University of Maryland

Questions		Frequencies Inst			tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
1. Did you qain new insights, skills from this course   1 0 0 3 3 16 25 15 3.74 1281/1649 3.77 3.96 4.28 4.11 3.74     2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1 0 6 4 15 28 9 3.46 1490/1648 3.67 3.88 4.23 4.16 3.48     3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1 1 8 12 17 16 8 3.07 1323/1375 3.30 3.57 4.27 4.10 3.07     4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1 0 3 6 15 22 6 3.42 1435/1595 3.30 3.57 4.27 4.10 3.07     5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   2 4 1 9 21 13 13 3.49 1259/1533 3.62 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.49     7. Was the grading system clearly explained   2 0 3 5 13 19 21 3.82 1245/1533 3.62 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.49     8. How many times was class cancelled   2 0 3 5 13 19 21 3.82 1245/1533 3.62 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.49     9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   2 1 0 1 0 1 0 12 47 4.26 687/1621 3.70 3.64 4.06 3.62     1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared   16 0 1 0 1 1 5 5 9 31 4.45 930/1568 4.32 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.33     1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared   16 0 1 1 0 1 12 33 4.62 1337/1572 4.04 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.45     2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   1 0 1 1 2 3 3 3.20 147/1569 3.70 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.67     2. Did class discussions contribute on what you learned   1 0 1 2 3 3 3 12 26 4.24 960/1564 3.97 3.90 4.28 4.20 3.89     3. Did the instructor encousy encoursed to participate   3 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.03 3.63 3.63 3.60 3.80 3.86 3.67     3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   4 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74     3. Were propried topics relevant to the amounced theme   4 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74     4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   4 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74     5. Did content provide assistance   4 0 6 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.35 4.04 4.07 4.35 4.35 4.08     5. Did content provides assistance   4 0 6 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.35 4.04 4.07 4.35 4.35 4.08 4.35 4.35 4.08 4.35 4.35 4.35 4.35 4.35 4	Ouestions	NR	NA		_			5		_					
1. Did you qain new insights, skills from this course   1 0 0 3 3 16 25 15 3.74 1381/1649 3.77 3.96 4.28 4.11 3.74															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1   8   12   17   16   8   3.07   1323/1375   3.30   3.57   4.27   4.10   3.07   5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   2   4   1   9   21   13   13   3.49   1255/1533   3.62   3.69   4.04   3.87   3.49   7. Was the grading system clearly explained   2   0   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	3	16	25	15	3.74	1381/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. Lecture 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. Lecture 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 9. How tould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 9. How tould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 9. How tould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 9. How tould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 9. How tould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 9. How tould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 9. How tould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 9. How tould you grade the overall prepared 21 9. How tould you grade the overall prepared 31 9. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 31 9. Were all the instructor seem interested in the subject 31 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 32 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 33 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 34 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34 9. Were special techniques successful 34 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 9. So 12 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 9. So 12 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 9. So 12 9. Were present projects contribute to what you learned 45 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 9. So 12 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 9. Were you ground to provided with adequate background information 44 9. So	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	28	9	3.48	1490/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 10 in 1 o 12 47.5 931/4623 3.48 4.84 4.16 4.08 3.82 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 in 0 in 1 o 1 in 1 o	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	12	17	16	8	3.07	1323/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 1 0 1 0 12 47 4.75 913/1646 4.76 4.83 4.84 1.60 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 8. Whow many times was class cancelled 9. 1 0 1 0 12 47 4.75 913/1646 4.76 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 8. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 16. 0 1 1 5 9 31 4.45 930/1568 4.32 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.33 17. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 18. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 19. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 19. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19. Were special techniques successful 19. Were special techniques understanding of the material 20. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 22. Were you provided with adequate background information 23. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 25. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26. Did the lab instructor available for ind bactivities 27. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 30. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 40. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 41. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 43. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 44. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 45. Were you provided with adequate background information 46. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 47. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 48. Did the lab instructor available fo	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	6	15	22	6	3.42	1435/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 3 5 13 19 21 3.82 1234/1623 3.94 3.94 4.16 4.08 3.82 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 1 0 12 7 4.75 931/1646 4.76 4.83 4.69 4.08 3.82 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 3 0 1 5 16 17 4.26 687/1621 3.70 3.64 4.06 3.96 3.82  Lecture  Lecture 1 1 5 9 31 4.45 930/1568 4.32 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.33 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 1 0 1 12 33 4.62 1133/1572 4.00 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17 0 2 3 3 12 24 4.21 132/1572 4.00 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.45 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 17 1 0 1 8 12 24 4.11 921/1599 3.93 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.98 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 8 4 2 5 11 7 3.00 824/1535 3.71 3.06 3.89 3.68 3.67  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.40 3.52 4.09 3.86 3.30 2. Were all students activour/interespect of participate 3 0 2 2 16 24 15 3.78 1080/1382 3.71 3.60 3.99 3.75 3.44  Were special techniques successful 3 6 7 5 13 15 14 3.44 727/948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ****/ 221 3.58 4.12 4.08 4.29 4.02 3.78 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 3 6 3 0 5 2 7 7 2 3 3 3 3 6 3 6 7 5 1 3 5 14 3.44 727/948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44  Were recessary materials available for abactivities 4 3 6 3 0 5 2 2 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	9	21	13	13	3.49	1255/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.49
8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 3 0 1 0 12 47 4.75 913/1646 4.76 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 3 0 1 5 16 17 4.26 687/1621 3.70 3.64 4.06 3.96 3.96 3.82    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 16 0 1 1 5 9 31 4.45 930/1568 4.32 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.33   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 1 0 1 12 2 33 4.62 1133/1572 4.40 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.45   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17 0 2 3 3 12 26 4.24 960/1564 3.97 3.90 4.28 4.20 3.99   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 8 4 2 5 11 17 3.90 824/1352 3.71 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.67    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.30   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 3 16 24 15 3.78 1080/1382 3.66 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.78   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.63 4.03 4.01 3.61   4. Were special techniques successful 37 1 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ***/21 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 ***  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ***/21 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 ***  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 43 6 0 1 7 7 3 2 3.29 ***/200 ***.4 3.0 4.0 4.3 ***  3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 41 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 43 6 0 1 7 7 3 2 3.29 ***/200 ***/200 ***.4 5.0 4.4 4.3 ****  4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 45 10 0 1 3 3 2 3.63 ***/200 ***.4 5.0 4.4 4.3 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reprotix clearly specified 41 10 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/5 3 3.05 3.05 3.00 4.09 3.55 3.5 3.5 3.6 4 3.29 4.10 3.55 3.5 3.5 3.6 4 3.3 3.6 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 4.0 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	8	4	13	10	3	2.89	1460/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	2.89
2. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   21   3   0   1   5   16   17   4.26   687/1621   3.70   3.64   4.06   3.96   3.82	7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	3	5	13	19	21	3.82	1234/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.82
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Nas lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Rere all students actively encouraged to participate 7. Did class discussion 7. Did class discussion scontribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 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 1. Eaboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Did researcy materials available for lab activities 43. O 5 1 1 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ****/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 **** 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 43. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 44. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 45. Were criteria for grading made clear 47. O 7. O 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.55 4.06 3.72 2.38 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 44. So 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45. Did you clearly understanding for contribute to what you learned 46. O 6 1 6 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 5. Were criteria for grading made clear  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45. Did you clearly understanding or contribute to what you learned 46. O 6 1 6 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.05 3.09 3.09 3.55  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47. O 7. O 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46. O 6 1 6 8 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.05 4.04 4.31 4.31 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field acti	8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	12	47	4.75	913/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75
1. were the instructor's lectures well prepared 16 0 1 1 5 5 9 31 4.45 930/1568 4.32 4.03 4.34 4.39 4.33 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 1 0 1 2 33 4.62 133/1572 4.04 0.23 4.70 4.64 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17 0 2 3 3 1 12 26 4.24 960/1564 3.97 3.90 4.28 4.20 3.98 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 8 4 2 5 11 17 3.90 824/1352 3.71 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.67    Discussion  Discussion  Discussion contribute to what you learned 3 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.67    Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.67    Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.63 4.03 4.03 3.78    Laboratory  Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ***/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 ***  Laboratory 2	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	0	1	5	16	17	4.26	687/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.82
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 7. 1 0 1 8 12 24 4.31 921/1559 3.93 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.89  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. 1 0 1 8 12 24 4.31 921/1559 3.93 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.89  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. 1 0 1 8 12 24 4.31 921/1559 3.93 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.89  7. 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. 2 1 1 1 7 3.90 824/1352 3.71 3.60 3.89 3.86 3.67  8. 2 2 3 16 24 1.5 3.78 1080/1382 3.61 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.00  9. 2 3 16 24 1.5 3.78 1080/1382 3.66 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.78  9. 3 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   17 0   2   3   3   12   26   4.24   960/1564   3.97   3.90   4.28   4.20   3.89   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   17 0   1   8   4   2   5   11   17   3.90   824/1352   3.71   3.60   3.98   3.86   3.67    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   3 0   8   9   12   19   12   3.30   1175/1384   3.40   3.52   4.08   3.86   3.30    2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   3 0   8   9   12   15   14   3.46   3.66   3.84   4.29   4.03   3.78    3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion   4 0   5   2   17   22   13   3.61   1140/1368   3.43   3.63   4.30   4.01   3.61    4. Were special techniques successful   3 0   7   5   13   15   14   3.44   727   948   3.43   3.50   3.95   3.75   3.44    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   37   11   2   1   8   1   3   3.13   ****/ 221   3.58   4.14   4.16   4.05   ****    2. Were you provided with adequate background information   44   0   6   1   6   4   2   2.74   229/243   3.25   4.08   4.18   4.08   2.74    3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities   43   6   3   0   5   2   4   3.29   ****/ 221   ****   4.30   4.04   4.43   ****    4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance   43   6   1   1   1   0   4   2   4   3.85   ****/ 281   ****   4.33   4.54   4.31   ****    5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   41   11   1   0   4   2   4   3.85   ****   88   ****   4.33   4.54   4.31   ****    5. Were criteria for grading made clear   44   5   0   2   4   5   3   3.64   ****   2.38   ****   4.33   4.54   4.31   ****    5. Were criteria for grading made clear   44   5   0   2   4   5   3   3.64   ****   2.38   ****   4.33   4.54   4.31   ****    6. Were position to the announced theme   41   9   0   1   4   4   4   3.85   ****   4.35   4.06   4.34   4.35   ****    7. Were position to the announced theme   41   9   0   1   4   4   3.85   ****   4.35   4.06   4.34   4.35   4.35	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	5	9	31	4.45	930/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 8 4 2 5 11 17 3.90 824/1352 3.93 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.98 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 8 4 2 5 11 17 3.90 824/1352 3.71 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.67 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 3 16 24 15 3.78 1080/1382 3.66 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.78 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.63 4.30 4.01 3.61 4. Were special techniques successful 3 6 7 5 13 15 14 3.44 727/ 948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ****/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/ 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 2.01 did he lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 3 0 5 2 4 3.29 ****/ 212 **** 4.30 4.04 4.3 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 1 1 7 3 2 3.29 ****/ 212 **** 4.09 4.29 4.14 ****  2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 10 0 1 3 3 2 3.63 ****/ 85 **** 4.09 4.29 4.14 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attente 41 9 0 1 1 4 2 4 3.85 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.31 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 10 0 1 3 3 1 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 5 0 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 2.54 4.07 4.30 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 44 5 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.75 4.07 ****  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.75 4.07 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.05 3.06 4.07 4.36 *****  3. Was the instructor available for individual attention 48 6 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	1	12	33	4.62	1133/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 8 4 2 5 11 17 3.90 824/1352 3.93 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.98 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 8 4 2 5 11 17 3.90 824/1352 3.71 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.60 3.98 3.98 3.98 3.99 3.99 3.99 3.99 3.99	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	2	3	3	12	26	4.24	960/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.30 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.63 4.30 4.01 3.61 4. Were special techniques successful 3 6 7 5 13 15 14 3.44 727/ 948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ****/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/ 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 1 1 7 3 2 3.29 ****/ 229 **** 4.30 4.04 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 1 1 7 3 2 3.29 ****/ 229 **** 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 1 1 7 3 2 3.29 ****/ 229 **** 4.03 4.04 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 11 1 0 4 2 4 3.73 ****/ 555 **** 4.09 4.29 4.14 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 10 0 1 3 3 1 3.55 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.31 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.35 4.01 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.35 4.01 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 49 0 1 1 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5 8 1 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 5. Did self-paced system contribute		17	1	0	1	8	12	24	4.31	921/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.98
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.30 2.00 2 3 16 24 15 3.78 1080/1382 3.66 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.78 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44 2.00 4.01 3.61 4. Were special techniques successful 3 7 11 2 1 8 1 3.44 727/ 948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44 2.00 4.01 3.61 4. Were special techniques successful 3 7 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ****/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 *** 2.00 Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/ 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 2.00 Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/ 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 2.00 Were recessary materials available for lab activities 43 6 3 0 5 2 4 3.29 ****/ 212 **** 4.30 4.40 4.43 **** 4.01 4.01 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	8	4	2	5	11	17	3.90	824/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.67
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 8 9 12 19 12 3.30 1175/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.66 3.84 3.29 4.03 3.78 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.63 4.30 4.03 3.78 1080/1382 3.66 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.78 1080 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ****/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 **** 2.00 Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/ 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74    2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/ 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74    3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 1 1 7 7 3 2 3.29 ****/ 212 **** 4.30 4.40 4.43 **** 2.00 Mere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 11 1 0 4 2 4 3.73 ****/ 555 **** 4.09 4.29 4.14 ****  2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2.00 Mass the instructor available for individual attention 3.00 Mark the instructor available for individual attention 45 10 0 1 3 3 2 3.63 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 **** 4.04 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.31 **** 4.04 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.31 **** 4.04 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 10 0 1 3 3 2 3.63 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 **** 4.04 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 46 7 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 2.01 display understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53 3.04 4.07 4.30 **** 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.07 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 2 3 16 24 15 3.78 1080/1382 3.66 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.78 3.01 dthe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.63 4.30 4.01 3.61 4. Were special techniques successful 3 6 7 5 13 15 14 3.44 727/948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 3.00 dthe lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 3 0 5 2 4 3.29 ****/ 212 **** 4.30 4.40 4.43 **** 4.01 dthe lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 1 1 7 3 2 3.29 ****/ 212 **** 4.30 4.40 4.43 **** 4.01 dthe lab instructor provide assistance 43 6 1 1 7 3 2 3.29 ****/ 209 **** 4.25 4.35 4.38 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 41 9 0 1 4 4 4 4 3.85 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.31 **** 4.01 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 45 10 0 1 3 2 2 3.63 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.31 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 **** 5.00 dresearch projects contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.43 4.39 **** 5.00 dresearch gradiang made clear 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 **** 5.00 dresearch gradiang made clear 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 **** 5.00 dresearch gradiang made clear 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 5.00 dresearch gradiang made clear 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 5.00 dresearch gradiang made clear 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53 3.00 dresearch gradiang made clear 47 0 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 5.01 dresearch gradiang made clear 47 0 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 5.01 dresearch gradiang made clear 47 0 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 5.01 dresearch gradiang made clear 47 0 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 5.01 dresearch gradiang made clear 47 0 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 5.01 dresearch gradiang mad		3	0	8	9	12	19	12	3.30	1175/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 5 2 17 22 13 3.61 1140/1368 3.43 3.63 4.30 4.01 3.61 4. Were special techniques successful 3 6 7 5 13 15 14 3.44 727/948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.44  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 ****/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0															
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Vere you provided with adequate background information 3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did green assigned expressed as a service of the provide assigned to the provide assigned as a service of the provide assigned to t			0	5	2	17	22	13							3.61
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 **** 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 3.09 **** 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10	-	3	6	7	5	13	15	14	3.44	727/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.44
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37 11 2 1 8 1 3 3.13 **** 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 3.09 **** 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10	- ,														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 44 0 6 1 6 4 2 2.74 229/ 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 2.74 3.0 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 43 6 3 0 5 2 4 3.29 ****/ 212 **** 4.30 4.40 4.43 **** 4.10 4.10 4.20 4 3.6 1 1 7 3 2 3.29 ****/ 210 **** 4.25 4.35 4.38 **** 5.00 4.47 4.35 4.38 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 4.29 4.14 **** 5.00 4.20 4 3.73 ****/ 555 5 *** 4.09 4.29 4.14 **** 5.00 4.20 4.20 4 3.73 ****/ 555 5 *** 4.09 4.29 4.14 **** 5.00 4.20 4.20 4 3.73 ****/ 555 5 *** 4.09 4.29 4.14 **** 5.00 4.20 4.20 4 3.20 4.20 4 3.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4				_	_		_	_						4 05	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities															
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 11 1 0 4 2 4 3.73 ****/ 555 **** 4.09 4.29 4.14 ****    Seminar							_	_							
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme								_							
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 41 9 0 1 4 4 4 3.85 **** 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.31 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 10 0 1 3 2 2 3.63 **** 85 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 10 0 1 3 3 1 3.50 **** 81 **** 5.00 4.43 4.39 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 **** 92 **** 4.50 4.35 4.01 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 44 5 0 2 4 5 3 3.64 **** 288 **** 3.83 3.68 3.54 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 2.00 does not instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2.06 3.06 3.05 3.06 3.06 3.05 3.06 3.05 3.06 3.06 3.05 3.06 3.06 3.06 3.06 3.06 3.06 3.06 3.06								_		,					
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 41 9 0 1 4 4 4 3.85 **** 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.31 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 10 0 1 3 2 2 3.63 **** 85 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 10 0 1 3 3 1 3.50 **** 85 **** 5.00 4.47 4.30 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 **** 92 **** 4.50 4.35 4.01 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 44 5 0 2 4 5 3 3.64 **** 288 *** 3.83 3.68 3.54 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 2.01 you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53 3.03 Was the instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 **** 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 **** 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 **** 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2.00 discuss your evaluations and activities 45 8 1 3 6 6 3 3.05 48 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2.00 discuss your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	ΤŢ	Т	U	4	2	4	3./3	^^^^/ 555	^^^	4.09	4.29	4.14	^^^
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 10 0 1 3 3 1 3.50 ****/ 81 **** 5.00 4.43 4.39 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.35 4.01 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 44 5 0 2 4 5 3 3.64 ****/ 288 **** 3.83 3.68 3.54 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ***/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56	-							4		,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 44 8 0 1 4 5 1 3.55 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 4.35 4.01 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 44 5 0 2 4 5 3 3.64 ****/ 288 **** 3.83 3.68 3.54 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.38 4.37 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56								_		,					
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.38 4.37 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56															
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.38 4.37 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56	-									,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 7 0 6 2 1 2.38 46/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 2.38 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.38 4.37 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 46 0 6 1 6 3 1 2.53 47/ 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 2.53 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.38 4.37 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 46 7 0 3 2 3 2 3.40 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.47 4.36 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.38 4.37 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56		47						1						3.72	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 46 8 0 1 7 0 1 3.11 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.38 4.37 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 8 1 3 4 1 1 2.80 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.51 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56		46						1	2.53			3.02	4.09	3.65	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		46					3	2	3.40	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56		46					0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 41 0 4 3 6 6 3 3.05 48/53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 3.05 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	8	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 41 3 0 2 8 5 4 3.58 24/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 3.58 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56	Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 42 5 1 2 5 3 5 3.56 36/41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 3.56	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	3	6	6	3	3.05	48/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	3.05
										24/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	3.58
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 41 5 0 1 7 4 5 3.76 20/ 24 3.76 4.18 4.42 4.24 3.76		42					3	5		36/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	3.56
								5							3.76
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 41 5 2 3 5 3 4 3.24 103/110 3.24 3.82 3.99 3.83 3.24	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	103/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	3.24

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 63

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 266

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35	_		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 267 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr	eque	ncie	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	1	0	3	3	16	25	15	3.74	1381/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	28	9		1490/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	8	12	17	16	8		1323/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	3	6	15	22	6		1435/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	9	21	13	13	3.49	1255/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	8	4	13	10	3	2.89	1460/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	13	19	21	3.82	1234/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	12	47	4.75	913/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	0	0	8	18	13	4.13	835/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	4	10	31	4.47	904/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	1	14	31	4.57	1174/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	2	2	4	15	23	4.20	1001/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	8	15	21	4.24	973/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	8	5	2	6	11	15	3.74	921/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	9	12	19	12		1175/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	16	24	15		1080/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	2	17	22	13		1140/1368		3.63	4.30		3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	7	5	13	15	14	3.44	727/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.44
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	11	2	1	8	1	3	3.13	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	6	1	6	4	2	2.74	229/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	2.74
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	6	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	6	1	1	7	3	2	3.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	11	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	9	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	10	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	10	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	8	0	1	4	5	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	5	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	7	0	6	2	1	2.38	46/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	2.38
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	6	1	6	3	1	2.53	47/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	2.53
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	7	0	3	2	3	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	8	0	1	7	0	1	3.11	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	8	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	3	6	6	3	3.05	48/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	3.05
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	3	0	2	8	5	4	3.58	24/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	3.58
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	5	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	36/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	3.56
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	5	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	20/ 24		4.18	4.42		3.76
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	5	2	3	5	3	4	3.24	103/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	3.24

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 63

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 267 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant .	
				I	0	Other	35	-			
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 72 Fall 2008

Page 268 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 61

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			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	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	1	3	9	28	15		1236/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	5	15	23	12		1375/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	4	9	11	18	13		1211/1375		3.57	4.27	4.10	3.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	15	4	5	14	11	5		1499/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	6	3	13	14	13		1242/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	26	3	1	8	9	6		1259/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	4	14	8	24		1149/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	8	41		1004/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	U	1	10	17	8	3.89	1078/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	4	9	37	4.61	731/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	4	6	41	4.73	985/1572		4.23	4.70	4.64	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	4	5	18	24	4.22	981/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	3	8	11	29	4.29	938/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	2	10	11	23	4.06	655/1352		3.60	3.98	3.86	4.07
1,														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	6	11	20	9	3.70	997/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	6	9	17	14	3.85	1053/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	10	18	10		1158/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	3	8	13	7	13	3.43	731/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.43
Laboratory			_		_	_							4 05	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	4	1	0	1	3	1		****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	1	2	0	4		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52 50	3	0	0	1	3 1	3 4		****/ 209 ****/ 555	****	4.25 4.09	4.35 4.29	4.38 4.14	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	U	U	3	1	4	4.13	/ 555		4.09	4.49	4.14	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83		****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	1	0	0	0	5		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	4		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
0.16 2														
Self Paced	<b>-</b> 1		_	^	_	-	_	2 10	****	2 25	2 50	4 20	4 1 1	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	0	3	1	3		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	1	0	2	1	4 5	3.88		3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52 53	0 3	1	1	1 1	1	5 4			3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53 53	2	0	1	1	0	4		****/ 24 ****/ 110	3.76 3.24	4.18	4.42 3.99	4.24 3.83	****
5. Were there enough procedus for all the students	23	4	U	Т	т	U	4	±.⊥/	/ 110	3.24	3.04	3.77	3.03	

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 268 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned				Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	25	-			
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 61

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 269 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	1	3	9	28	15	3 95	1236/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	5	15	23	12		1375/1648	3.67		4.23	4.16	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	4	9	11	18	13		1211/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	15	4	5	14	11	5		1499/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	6	3	13	14			1242/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	26	3	1	8	9			1259/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	4	14	8			1149/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	8	41	4.70	1004/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	4	7	14	5	3	2.88	1541/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	1	3	4	10	15	4.06	1252/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	3	1	5	7	20		1445/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	4	1	12	7			1382/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	4	8	9	10		1333/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	6	2	3	9	5	10	3.62	991/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	6	11	20	9	3.70	997/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	6	9	17	14		1053/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	10	18			1158/1368		3.63		4.01	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	3	8	13	7	13	3.43	731/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	2	4	0	3		****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	2	0	4		****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	1	0	0	0	5		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	4		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	0	3	1	3		****/ 53	3.05		4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	1	1	1	1	5		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	3	0	0	1	0	4		****/ 24	3.76		4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 61

72

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 269 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	А	 7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	25	_		_	
				?	1						

CHEM 101 0203

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GARRETT

Questionnaires: 61

Enrollment: 72

GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Page 270
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					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	5	0	1	3	9	28	15	3.95	1236/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	5	15	23	12	3.71	1375/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	4	9	11	18	13	3.49	1211/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	15	4	5	14	11	5	3.21	1499/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	6	3	13	14	13	3.51	1242/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	26	3	1	8	9	6	3.52	1259/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	4	14	8	24	3.92	1149/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	8	41	4.70	1004/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	0	0	0	2	14	15	4.42	497/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	2	0	0	5	21	4.54	815/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	790/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	326/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	1	1	6	20	4.48	722/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	5	1	2	3	2	16	4.25	515/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	6	11	20	9	3.70	997/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	6	9	17	14		1053/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	10	18	10	3.57	1158/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	3	8	13	7	13	3.43	731/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	2	4	0	3		****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	1	2	0	4			****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 555	***	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	1	1	1	1	5		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 110	3.24	3.82		3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 270 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 61

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned				Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	25	-			
				?	1						

University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 61

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 271 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	1	3	9	28	15	3.95	1236/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	5	15	23	12		1375/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	4	9	11	18	13		1211/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	15	4	5	14	11	5	3.21	1499/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	6	3	13	14	13	3.51	1242/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	26	3	1	8	9	6	3.52	1259/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	4	14	8	24	3.92	1149/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	4	8	41	4.70	1004/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	0	0	1	0	18	12	4.32	607/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	2	0	0	5	21	4.54			4.13	4.43	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	0	7	26		1022/1572		4.23	4.70	4.64	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	1	0	6	23	4.70	- ,		3.90	4.28	4.20	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	1	2	4	21	4.48		3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	6	0	2	3	3	15	4.35	448/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	6	11	20	9	3.70			3.52	4.08	3.86	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	6	9	17	14		1053/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	4	10	18	10		1158/1368		3.63	4.30	4.01	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	3	8	13	7	13	3.43	731/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	2	0	0	1	3	3		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	3	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	,	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40		****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	1	1	0	4		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	1	2	0	4		****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	, -	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	1	0	0	0	5		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	4		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced		-	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	3	0	3	1	3		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88		3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52 53	0 3	1	1	1	1	5 4		****/ 41 ****/ 24	3.56 3.76	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	1	1	0	4		****/ 110			4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	۷	U	Т	Т	U	4	4. I /	/ 110	3.24	3.8∠	3.99	3.83	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 61 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 271 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	25	-		_	
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 55

Baltimore County CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Fall 2008

Page 272 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	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	2	0	1	6	15	17	14	3.70	1408/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	15	22	13	3.78	1333/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	12	21	9	3.50	1208/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	2	5	8	17	5	3.49	1406/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	3	7	13	12	3.48	1269/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	4	0	10	7	4	3.28	1363/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	8	13	24	4.00	1029/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	43	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	1	8	26	8	3.89	1078/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.74
Lecture	2	0	0	•	_	0	2.0	4 60	E15 /1560	4 20	4 10	4 42	4 20	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	8	39		715/1568		4.13	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	11	35		1184/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	2	9	15	20		1118/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4 7	0	0 3	6	9	10	26		1079/1559		3.79	4.29		3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	/	1	3	5	6	14	19	3.87	836/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	11	17	16	3.76	959/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	6	8	11	20		1128/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	13	13	14		1150/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30		3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	4	5	10	12	16	3.66	651/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95		3.66
	_	-	_	_					,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar	4.0	1	0	^	1	_	0	2 02	****/ OO		4 22	4 - 4	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	1	5	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	3	0	0	1	1	1 2	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	2 2	0	0	1	3	_		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	U	U	Т	3	1	4.00	****/ 288		3.83	3.68	3.54	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	3	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	0	1	3	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
		-	•	-	_	_	-		,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 72 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 272 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 55 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	 11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	36	-		_	
				?	1						

11. CHEM 101 0204

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMIL

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 273 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				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	2	0	1	6	15	17	14	3.70	1408/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	15	22	13		1333/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	12	21	9		1208/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	2	5	8	17	5		1406/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	3	7	13	12		1269/1533		3.69	4.04	3.87	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	4	0	10	7	4		1363/1512			4.10	3.86	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	8	13	24		1029/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	43		865/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	3	5	14	18	2	3.26	1449/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.74
Tashiina														
Lecture	1 -	0	0	1	0	_	0.0	4 40	002/1560	4 20	4 12	4 42	4 20	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0 0	0	1	8	5	26 21	4.40	983/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16		1	2	6 12	9 10			1406/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18 14	0 1	5	7	12 8	10 5	12 15		1267/1564 1389/1559	3.97 3.93	3.90 3.79	4.28 4.29	4.20	4.06 3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	3	5	5	o 7	5 5			1049/1352		3.60	3.98		3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	5	5	/	5	14	3.50	1049/1352	3./1	3.00	3.90	3.00	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	11	17	16	3.76	959/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	6	8	11	20		1128/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	13	13	14		1150/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	4	5	10	12			651/ 948			3.95	3.75	
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar		_		_		_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.03	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	3	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	2	0	0	1 1	1	2		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	U	U	Τ	3	1	4.00	****/ 288		3.83	3.68	3.54	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	2	1	2	2 67	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	3	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	0	1	3	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid accivities	10	J	U	U	_	J	U	3.75	/ 312		1.30	3.00	J.JI	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	3	1		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1		****/ 110			3.99	3.83	****
		-	-											

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 55

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 273 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	22								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough					
				P	0			responses to	gnificant				
				I	0	Other	36	-					
				?	1								

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 274

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	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	2	0	1	6	15	17	14		1408/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	15	22	13		1333/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	12	21	9		1208/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	2	5	8	17	5		1406/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	3	7	13	12		1269/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	4	0	10	7	4		1363/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	8	13	24		1029/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	43	4.79	865/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	0	10	22	6	3.89	1069/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	4	6	24	4.59	755/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	3	13	20		1321/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	1	0	4	14	14	4.21	981/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	3	8	10	13		1206/1559		3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	6	3	1	7	4	13	3.82	866/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.74
Discussion			_						050/4004			4 00		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	11	17	16	3.76	959/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	6	8	11	20		1128/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	13	13	14		1150/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	4	5	10	12	16	3.66	651/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.66
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Quantum and														
Seminar	4.0	1	^	0	1	_	0	2 02	****/ OO	****	4 22	4 - 4	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48 48	1 2	0	0	1	5 1	0 1	3.83	****/ 88 ****/ 85	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	3	0	0	1	1	1	3.60 4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00 5.00	4.47 4.43	4.30 4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 92	***	4.50	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	0	0	1	3	1		****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
5. Note differia for grading made crear	10	-	Ü	Ü	_	3	_	1.00	, 200		3.03	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	3	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1		****/ 110		3.82	3.99	3.83	****
The state of the s	- 0	•	-	_	_	-	_		, 110		02		05	

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 72 Questionnaires: 55

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	F 0 Electives		1	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	ignificant	
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

Page 274

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D) Instructor: Enrollment:

72

Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 275 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetion	$n \circ i \circ n \circ a$

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	6	15	17	14	3.70	1408/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	15	22	13	3.78	1333/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	12	21	9	3.50	1208/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	2	5	8	17	5	3.49	1406/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	3	7	13	12	3.48	1269/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	4	0	10	7	4	3.28	1363/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	8	13	24	4.00	1029/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	43	4.79	865/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	2	7	22	8	3.92	1030/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	4	6	22	4.48	878/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	2	2	13	19		1346/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	1	0	4	14	14	4.21	981/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	2	9	10	13		1189/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	6	2	2	8	4	12	3.79	893/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.74
Discussion														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	11	17	16	3.76	959/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	<i>5</i>	6	8	11	20		1128/1382	3.40	3.84	4.08	4.03	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	13	13	14		1150/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.03	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	5	10				651/ 948	3.43			3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	4	5	10	12	10	3.00	031/ 940	3.43	3.30	3.95	3.75	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	1	2	1	2	3,67	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	3	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	3	0	0	1	3	0		,	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
The state of the s		2	-	ŭ	-	-	J		, 512			00		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	2	1			3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	2	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 55

72

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 275 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	22							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	36	_				
				?	1							

I 101 0205 University of Maryland
OF CHEMISTRY I Baltimore County

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

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 58

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 276 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills	from this course	2	Ο	4	6	13	15	18	3 66	1429/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the		3	0	4	6	16	19	10		1504/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect th		5	0	8	11	18	10	6		1342/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the		6	10	5	9	15	11	2		1554/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute		5	4	3	10	8	19	9		1303/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribut	-	5	23	3	6	12	6	3	3.00	1428/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly ex		7	1	5	9	10	11	15	3.44	1415/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelle	d d	8	1	1	0	1	5	42	4.78	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	20	1	3	3	9	18	4	3.46	1375/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.43
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures we		6	0	1	1	8	13	29		1080/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem intereste	_	7	0	1	3	5	16	26		1406/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented an		9	0	4	9					1427/1564	3.97	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to wh		7	2	5	3	6	16	19		1231/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhanc	e your understanding	8	4	5	5	9	ΤŢ	16	3.61	1002/1352	3.71	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.40
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute	to what you learned	8	0	7	5	12	15	11	3.36	1143/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.36
2. Were all students actively encour		8	0	6	5	13	7	19	3.56	1191/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair	_	12	0	7	3	14	14	8	3.28	1244/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.28
4. Were special techniques successfu	1	12	7	9	3	7	7	13	3.31	789/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understandin		49	4	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate b		49	0	3	1	3	0	2		****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials availabl		49	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide as	sistance	50	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports	clearly specified	47	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to	the announced theme	51	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for	individual attention	51	3	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute	_	52	5	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to w	-	51	2	1	0	2	1	1		,	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made cl	ear	51	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute t	o what you learned	53	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your e	valuation criteria	54	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for	consultation	54	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss	your evaluations	54	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry ou	t field activities	53	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Pace															
1. Did self-paced system contribute	_	53	0	0	0	2	1	2		****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear th		53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instr		53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proc	_	52	1	0	0	2	1	2		****/ 24	3.76		4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for al	I the students	53	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 58

Title

CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 276 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	_			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I Instructor:

Enrollment:

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Ouestionnaires: 58

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 277

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 4 6 13 15 18 3.66 1429/1649 3.77 3.96 4.28 4.11 3.66 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 4 6 16 19 10 3.45 1504/1648 3.67 3.88 4.23 4.16 3.45 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 8 11 18 10 6 2.91 1342/1375 3.30 3.57 4.27 4.10 2.91 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 10 5 9 15 11 2 2.90 1554/1595 3.38 3.74 4.20 4.03 2.90 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 4 3 10 8 19 9 3.43 1303/1533 3.62 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.43 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 23 3 6 12 6 3 3.00 1428/1512 3.41 3.72 4.10 3.86 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 7 1 5 9 10 11 15 3.44 1415/1623 3.84 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.44 8. How many times was class cancelled 8 1 1 0 1 5 42 4.78 881/1646 4.76 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.78 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 28 1 2 3 10 12 2 3.31 1436/1621 3.70 3.64 4.06 3.96 3.43 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 18 0 2 2 7 11 18 4.03 1270/1568 4.32 4.13 4.43 4.39 3.92 15 0 2 1 7 10 23 4.19 1422/1572 4.40 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.14 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 20 0 3 3 9 15 8 3.58 1368/1564 3.97 3.90 4.28 4.20 3.61 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 18 2 6 1 9 12 10 3.50 1370/1559 3.93 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 5 3 6 6 15 7 3.46 1075/1352 3.71 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.40 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 5 12 15 11 3.36 1143/1384 3.40 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.36 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 5 13 7 19 3.56 1191/1382 3.66 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.56 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 7 3 14 14 8 3.28 1244/1368 3.43 3.63 4.30 4.01 3.28 4. Were special techniques successful 12 7 9 3 7 7 13 3.31 789/ 948 3.43 3.50 3.95 3.75 3.31 Laboratory 0 1 2.80 \*\*\*\*/ 221 3.58 4.14 4.16 4.05 \*\*\*\* 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 49 0 3 1 3 0 2 2.67 \*\*\*\* 243 3.25 4.03 4.12 4.08 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 49 3 0 0 3 1 2 3.83 \*\*\*\*/ 212 \*\*\*\* 4.30 4.40 4.43 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 50 2 1 0 1 2 2 3.67 \*\*\*\* 209 \*\*\*\* 4.25 4.35 4.38 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 47 4 2 0 1 0 4 3.57 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.09 4.29 4.14 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 3.75 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.54 4.31 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 51 3 0 1 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.30 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 52 5 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.43 4.39 \*\*\*\* 51 2 1 0 2 1 1 3.20 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.35 4.01 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 51 4 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.83 3.68 3.54 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 53 0 3 0 1 1 2.20 \*\*\*\*/ 52 2.38 3.25 4.06 3.72 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 54 0 2 0 0 1 1 2.75 \*\*\*\* 48 2.53 3.02 4.09 3.65 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 54 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\* 39 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.36 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 54 3 0 0 1 0 0 3.00\*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.38 4.37 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 53 2 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 312 \*\*\*\* 4.38 3.68 3.51 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 53 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 3.05 3.70 4.30 4.17 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  $\,$  53  $\,$  0  $\,$  0 0 2 2 1 3.80 \*\*\*\*/ 30 3.58 3.72 4.16 4.06 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 53 0 0 1 1 1 2 3.80 \*\*\*\*/ 41 3.56 4.04 4.43 4.27 \*\*\*\*

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 52 1 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 24 3.76 4.18 4.42 4.24 \*\*\*\*

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 53 0 0 0 4 0 1 3.40 \*\*\*\*/ 110 3.24 3.82 3.99 3.83 \*\*\*\*

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 67

Title

Questionnaires: 58

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

## Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	-		_	
				?	1						

Page 277

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Instructor: Enrollment:

67

Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 278 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	6	13	15	18	3.66	1429/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	6	16	19	10	3.45	1504/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	8	11	18	10	6		1342/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	5	9	15	11	2		1554/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	10	8	19	9		1303/1533	3.62	3.69		3.87	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	6	12	6	3		1428/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	5	9	10	11	15		1415/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	1	0	1	5	42	4.78	881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	2	1	3	12	9	4	3.41	1399/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.43
T a whoma														
Lecture	٥.	0	_	_	7	0	11	2 50	1446/1560	4 20	4 12	4 42	4 20	2 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	6 3	0 1	7	9	13		1446/1568	4.32	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21		<i>3</i>	1	5	13 12	10		1500/1572	4.40	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14 3.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24 24	0 3	2	2	8	9	10		1374/1564 1283/1559	3.97 3.93	3.90 3.79	4.28 4.29	4.20 4.20	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	11	3	3	6	6	4				3.60			3.40
5. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	25	11	3	3	O	0	4	3.43	11/0/1352	3.71	3.00	3.90	3.00	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	5	12	15	11	3.36	1143/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	5	13	7	19		1191/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	7	3	14	14	8		1244/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.28
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	9	3	7	7	13	3.31	789/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	3	1	3	0	2	2.67	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	2	1	0	1	2	2		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Quantum and														
Seminar	г1	2	1	_	0	1	0	2 75	****/ OO	****	4 22	4 - 4	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	1	0	0	1	∠ 1		****/ 88 ****/ 85	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
<ol> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	51 52	3 5	0	0	3 1	0	1	3.50	****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	5.00	4.47 4.43	4.30 4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	1	0	2	1	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	4	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 288	****	3.83		3.54	***
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	JI	-	U	U	2		U	3.33	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	2	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68		****
1. 11. Sometimes mary for early out field decivities	55		3	J	_	_	_	2.00	, 512		1.50	2.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	2	2	1			3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 110	3.24	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 58

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 278 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	_			
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 67

SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)

Questionnaires: 58

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 279 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

			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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	6	13	15	18	3.66	1429/1649	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	6	16	19	10	3.45	1504/1648	3.67	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	8	11	18	10	6		1342/1375	3.30	3.57	4.27	4.10	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	5	9	15	11	2		1554/1595	3.38	3.74	4.20	4.03	2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	10	8	19	9		1303/1533	3.62	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	23	3	6	12	6	3		1428/1512	3.41	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	5	9	10	11	15		1415/1623	3.84	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	1	0	1	5	42		881/1646	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	2	2	2	8	13	4	3.52	1340/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.43
Lecture														
	٥٢	0	4	0	7	1.0	10	2 70	1201/1560	4 20	1 12	1 12	4 20	2 00
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>	25 21	0	1	0	6	10 11	12 19		1391/1568 1393/1572	4.32 4.40	4.13	4.43	4.39 4.64	3.92 4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	2	1	7	13	11		1229/1564	3.97	3.90	4.70	4.20	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	1	10	9	12		1197/1559	3.93	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	10	3	3	6	6	5		1143/1352		3.60	3.98		3.40
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	10	J	5	U	U	J	3.30	1143/1332	3.71	3.00	3.90	3.00	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	5	12	15	11	3.36	1143/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	5	13	7	19		1191/1382	3.66	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	7	3	14	14	8		1244/1368	3.43	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.28
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	9	3	7	7	13	3.31	789/ 948	3.43	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 221	3.58	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	3	1	3	0	2	2.67	****/ 243	3.25	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	2	1	0	1	2	2		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar		_												
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	1	0	0	1	2		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	3	0	0	3	0	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	5	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2 4	1	0	2	1 1	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	4	U	U	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 288		3.83	3.68	3.54	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	0	1	0	1	2 20	****/ 52	2.38	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	2	0	0	1	1		****/ 48	2.53	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	2	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
J. Did conferences neip you carry out freid accryticles	55	۷	U	U	Τ.	т		4.00	/ 312		1.30	3.00	3.51	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 53	3.05	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 30	3.58	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2		****/ 41	3.56	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	0	0	2	1	2		****/ 24	3.76	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	4	0			****/ 110	3.24		3.99	3.83	****
		-	-	-	_	-	_		,					

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 58

Title

University of Maryland Page 279 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	2	 А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	-			
				?	1						

PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Title Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 280 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	\$ 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	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	965/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	897/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1176/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	4			1335/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	1			1395/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1 0	2		4.67 4.83	321/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2 6		4.83	782/1646 442/1621	4.58 3.48	4.83 3.64	4.69	4.67 3.96	4.83
	1	U	U	U	U	0	J	4.45	442/1021	3.40	3.04	4.00	3.90	3.39
Lecture			•			_			000/4550	4 00	4 40	4 40	4 00	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	220/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0 1	0	0	0	0	0 4	12 7	5.00	1/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64 4.20	4.00
<ol> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.64	511/1564 1031/1559	3.39 3.41	3.90 3.79	4.28 4.29	4.20	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	4		4.36	432/1352			3.98	3.86	
	Ü	_	Ü	_	J	-	Ū	1.50	132/1332	3.03	3.00	3.70	3.00	2.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3		1192/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	887/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0 2	0 1	1 1	3	1 4		4.09	922/1368 789/ 948	3.93 3.46	3.63 3.50	4.30	4.01 3.75	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	U	2	1		3	4	1	3.30	709/ 940	3.40	3.30	3.95	3.75	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	⊥.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 280 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Title Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12 Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 281 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	965/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	897/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	4		1176/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	4	2		1335/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	3.71	3.69		3.87	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	1			1395/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.67	321/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2			782/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	1	5	1	0	2.75	1561/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	1 11	930/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02
2. Did the instructor's seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	0	5		1463/1572	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	3	0	2		1529/1564	3.39	3.90	4.70	4.20	3.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	0	3	2		1479/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	1	2	0		1287/1352	3.09	3.60			2.81
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	J	J	_	2		2	U	2.07	1207/1332	3.05	3.00	3.90	3.00	2.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1192/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	887/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	922/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	789/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	***	4.09	4.29	4.14	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	Λ	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 288	****	3.83		3.54	****
The state of the s														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 281 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 282 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	965/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	897/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1176/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1335/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1395/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	782/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	1	1	5	0	3.25	1451/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1446/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1517/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1485/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	1506/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1316/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	2.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1192/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	887/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	922/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	789/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52	***	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced		_			_									
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 282 FEB 11, 2009 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 A 8 Requir		Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 283 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
1	General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	965/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.25
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	897/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.25
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	4		1176/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.58
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	4			1335/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.67
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	966/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.86
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	1	-		1395/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.20
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.67	321/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.67
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2			782/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.83
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	1	2	4	0		1483/1621		3.64		3.96	3.39
	Lecture														
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	1	1	2		1506/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.02
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1551/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	0	3	0	2	2.75	1532/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.32
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	0	2	1	2.50	1528/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.14
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1346/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	2.81
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3		1192/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.25
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	887/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.17
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	1		4.09	922/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.09
4.	Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	789/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.30
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 12

MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. D)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 283 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR Baltimore County Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Page 284 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enr	collme	nt:	12	
_			_	

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	cructor	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	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4 56	577/1649	4 40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.56
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	1		1245/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.89
		estions reflec			0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.00
	_	ations reflect		1 3	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	890/1595	3.93		4.20	4.03	4.20
				what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	2		1200/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.57
				o what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	0		1170/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.67
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	4			720/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.33
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	6			1340/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69		4.33
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	720/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.57
		Lectur	e															
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.59
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.12
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.45
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.69
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	4	4	4.50	303/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.65
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1060/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.56
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.44
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.78
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	667/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.63
		Labora	-															
_	-	_		ground information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Туј	pe			Majors	;			
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						Re	 anir		or Ma	iore	 !	0	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		1/6/	datt.	JU II	O1 140	. ,	,	J	Graduat	_		1.10. ) (		_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							1	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	major	8
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0				General							_	onaci g.		-	1,011		0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh	
P 0											#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							
I 0					Other 7													
? 0						00.												

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
12

Page 285 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)	Fall 2008
Enrollment:	12	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies					T		Course Dept		TIMDO	T 1	0	
			Ouestion	g		NR	NA	1	equei 2	3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank		_	Mean	Level	Sect Mean
			Genera	1															
1.	Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.56
2.	Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1245/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.89
3.	Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.00
4.	Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	890/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.20
5.	Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1200/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.57
6.	Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.67
7.	Was the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.33
8.	How man	y times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33
9.	How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	1571/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.57
			T	_															
1 1	Were th	e instru	Lectur		nrenared	4	0	0	0	1	Λ	4	4.60	731/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.59
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	1	1	3		1321/1572		4.23	4.70	4.64	4.12
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							1	0	2	1	0		1532/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	3.45
			s contribute t			5 4	0	0	2	0	1	2		1344/1559		3.79	4.29	4.20	3.69
					your understanding	4	0	1	1	1	2	0		1270/1352			3.98		3.65
_			Discus																
					what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2		1060/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.56
					ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382		3.84	4.29	4.03	4.44
			_		nd open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	1	4		1085/1368		3.63			3.78
4.	Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	667/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.63
			Labora	torv															
2.	Were vo	n provid		-	kground information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
	_	_	_		learly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 555		4.09	4.29		****
	o, were requirements for run reports creating specified																		
	Fre								utio	n									
Cre	dits Ea	irned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						Red	quir	ed i	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1	
	-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		_						_	1					
56	-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	Τ				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	8

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0 #### - Means ther		there	e are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant		
				I	0	Other	7	-	-			
				2	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201 University of Maryla Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR Baltimore County Instructor: MACDONALD, JANE (Instr. C) Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 286
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	12	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

P 0

0

I 0

?

Questions							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	5		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		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.56	
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	1		1245/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.89	
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.00	
		uations reflect			0	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	890/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1200/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.57	
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How wou	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1225/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.57	
		Lectur		_	•	_		•	•	_				4 4 4 4	4 40		4 50		
1. Were th			5	0	0 1	1	0	0	3		1121/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.59			
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	3	1		1529/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.12	
	<ol> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>							0 1	0	1	1		1472/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.45	
				you learned our understanding	5	0	1 1	0	0	1	1		1479/1559 ****/1352	3.41	3.79 3.60	4.29	4.20	3.69 3.65	
5. Did aud	ulovisua.	r techniques en	lance y	our understanding	5	۷	Т	U	U	1	U	2.50	/1352	3.09	3.00	3.90	3.00	3.05	
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1060/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.56	
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44		4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.44	
				d open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01		
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	0	1	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	667/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.63	
		Labora	_																
_	-	_		ground information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****	
	<u>_</u>																		
	Free								1										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	sons				ТУ	pe			Majors	3	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1	
28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 4										J - ~									
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	8	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0					2011-01-01			_				-							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves		0			#### - Means there				are not enough		

Other

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201 University of Maryla:
Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR Baltimore County
Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D) Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 287
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	12	
Questionnaires:	9	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

Questions							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain new	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.40	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.56
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	1		1245/1648	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.89
		estions reflec			0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	950/1375	3.79	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.00
		ations reflect			0	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	890/1595	3.93	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.20
5. Did as:	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1200/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.57
6. Did wr	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1512	3.43	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.67
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.33
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	6	3		1340/1646	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.48	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.57
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well 1	orepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	852/1568	4.30	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.59
		tor seem inter			4	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1529/1572	4.06	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.12
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1472/1564	3.39	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.45
4. Did the	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1408/1559	3.41	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.69
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	3.09	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.65
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	1060/1384	3.40	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.56
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	4.31	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.44
				d open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.78
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful	-	0	1	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	667/ 948	3.46	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.63
		Labora	torv															
2. Were v	ou provide		-	ground information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
				early specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	***
				Frequ	encv	Dist	tribı	ıtior	า									
	r i e								-									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;			
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Maj						Majo	r	1			
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	8
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0 Other							Other 7										

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 288 FEB 11, 2009 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	0	1	6	3	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1127/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1435/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	3	4	3		1385/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	1	3	2		1345/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3		10	4.11	968/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2		4.75	913/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1440/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	1	3	9	3.88	1354/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	0	3	11	4.29	1387/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	1	5	7		1321/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	8	7		1098/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	4	2	2	4	1	2.69	1284/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	1169/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	875/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	2	9		1006/1368	3.42	3.63		4.01	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	555/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

28

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 288 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor:

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 289 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	3	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	7		1127/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	3	5	3		1435/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1385/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	1	3			1345/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	968/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2			913/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69		4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	588/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	851/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	690/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.84
Discussion	2	0	3	1	3	6	3	2 21	1160/1204	2 10	2 [2	4 00	3.86	3.31
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2 2	0	0	1 1	3	4	8	4.19	1169/1384 875/1382	3.19 3.79	3.52 3.84	4.08	4.03	4.19
<ol> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> </ol>	2	0	2	1	2	2	9		1006/1368	3.42	3.63	4.29	4.03	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	555/ 948	3.50		3.95		3.86
4. Were special techniques successivi	۷	۷	_	U	5	4	0	3.00	333/ 940	3.50	3.30	3.95	3.75	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	1	0	0		****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	***
Field Work			•	•	_									****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 289 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	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	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor:

GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18 Fall 2008

Page 290 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	3	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1127/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1435/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1385/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	968/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	913/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.62
Lecture						_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	636/1568		4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	7		1034/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	342/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	3			1060/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	457/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	6	3	2 21	1169/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	875/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	2	9		1006/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	555/ 948		3.50	3.95		3.86
1. Here special commiques successful	_	_	_	Ū		_		3.00	333, 310	3.30	3.30	3.75	3.73	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar		_												
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.02	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68		****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	1.0	U	U	U	Τ.		U	3.30	/ 312		1.50	3.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 290 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

28

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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-		_	
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 18

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 291 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	3	8		1183/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	9		1124/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	7		1127/1375	3.83	3.57		4.10	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	1	3	5	3		1435/1595	3.64		4.20	4.03	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	3	3	4	3		1385/1533	3.58		4.04	3.87	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	1	3	2		1345/1512	3.55		4.10	3.86	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	968/1623	4.12		4.16	4.08	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	13		913/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	0	6	1	3.56	1323/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	791/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	4	6		1146/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	524/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	3		1211/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	457/1352	3.69		3.98	3.86	3.84
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11		U	U	U	-	2	1.33	437/1332	3.09	3.00	3.70	3.00	3.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	1169/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	875/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1006/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	555/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.86
- ,														
Laboratory			•		_	_		4 00					4 05	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0 1	1	0	2		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	Т	U	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	***	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	***	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	***	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	3.70	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 110	****		3.99		****
J. Here effect chough proceeds for all the scudelles	± /	J	J	J	_	J	U	5.00	, 110		J. UZ	3.22	٥.00	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, RONA (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 28 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 291 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 69 Questionnaires: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 292 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	-ane	ncie	s		Insi	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	4	0	1	1	7	14	15	4.08	1136/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.08
2. Did	the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	9	11	16	4.05	1094/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.05
3. Did	the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	862/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.19
4. Did	other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	2	7	9	9	3.93	1175/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.93
5. Did	assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	11	9	10	3.87	945/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.87
6. Did	written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1113/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.76
	the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	8	18	4.23	849/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.23
	many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	897/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76
	would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	0	9	7	10		1030/1621		3.64			3.77
	. 3														
	Lecture														
1. Were	the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	1	7	26	4.63	699/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.38
2. Did	the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	7	28	4.75	931/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.49
3. Was	lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	4	12	19	4.36	822/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.20
	the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	11	20	4.33	901/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.25
	audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	2	3	6	11	10	3.75	914/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.89
	-														
	Discussion														
1. Did	class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	5	5	7	12	3.55	1064/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.55
2. Were	all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	9	11	3.79	1080/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79
3. Did	the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	6	6	7	11	3.52	1177/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.52
	special techniques successful	10	3	7	3	4	4	11	3.31	784/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31
	Laboratory														
1. Did	the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
	you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
	necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did	the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were	requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
	Seminar														
1. Were	assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was	the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did	research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did	presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were	criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
	Field Work														
1. Did	field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did	you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was	the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To w	hat degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did	conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
	Self Paced														
	self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
	study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
	your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
	the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were	there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 69

Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 292 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 A	 6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	-			
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 69 Questionnaires: 42

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 293 FEB 11, 2009 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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	1	7	14	15	4.08	1136/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	9	11	16	4.05	1094/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	862/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	2	7	9	9	3.93	1175/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	11	9	10	3.87	945/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1113/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	8	18	4.23	849/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	897/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	2	3	7	10	3	3.36	1419/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	3	5	16	A 31	1080/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	2	6	17		1273/1572		4.23	4.70	4.64	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	2	1	9		11		1292/1564		3.90	4.70	4.20	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	3	5	<i>5</i>	10		1226/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	3	2	7	3	7		1101/1352		3.60	3.98	3.86	3.89
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1/	3	3	4	,	3	,	3.41	1101/1352	3.09	3.00	3.90	3.00	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	5	5	7	12		1064/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	9	11	3.79	1080/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	6	6	7	11	3.52	1177/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	7	3	4	4	11	3.31	784/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	2	2	0	3 20	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	3	1	1		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	2	2	0		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar						•	_	4 = 0			4 00			****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	U	Τ	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.70	4.16	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.43	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 110	****			3.83	****
J. WELL CHIEFE CHOUGH PLOCEOUS TOT ALL THE SCUUCHES	<b>T</b> U	U	U	U	Τ.	U	_	Ŧ.UU	/ 110		5.02	3.23	٥.0٥	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 69

Questionnaires: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0 Electives		0	#### - Means	are not enough	ugh	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_			
				?	1						

Page 293

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Instructor: Enrollment: 69

Questionnaires: 42

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 294 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	4	0	1	1	7	1 /	1 -	4 00	1126/1640	2 07	2 06	4 00	1 11	4.08
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	4 4	0	1	1 1	9	14 11	15 16		1136/1649 1094/1648	3.87 4.01	3.96 3.88	4.28	4.11 4.16	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	862/1375	3.83	3.57	4.23	4.10	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	2	7	9	9		1175/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.10	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	11	9	10			3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	3	3	7	7		1113/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	8	18	4.23	849/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	897/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	5	0	0	5	12			1060/1621				3.96	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	3	7	13		1050/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	2	7	14		1313/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	812/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	841/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	4	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	582/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.89
Discussion				_	_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	5	5	7	12		1064/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	9	11		1080/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	6	6	7	11		1177/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	7	3	4	4	ΤŢ	3.31	784/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	2	2	0		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar				•	_		_	4 = 0			4 00		4 04	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	***	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0 1	1	0	3.00		****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	39 39	0 1	0	0	1	1	1 1	1.00	****/ 92 ****/ 288	****	4.50 3.83	4.35 3.68	4.01 3.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	U	U	1	U	1	4.00	****/ 288		3.83	3.08	3.54	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00		****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 69

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 294 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2	
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	20							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	F 0 Electives		0	#### - Means	#### - Means there are not enou			
				P	0			responses to	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	25	-				
				?	1							

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 69 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 295

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	1	7	14	15	4.08	1136/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	9	11	16	4.05	1094/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	862/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	2	7	9	9	3.93	1175/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	11	9	10	3.87	945/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1113/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	8	18	4.23	849/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	897/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	1060/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.77
T a shoot														
Lecture	1.0	0	1	1	0	-	1 2	4 05	1101/1560	1 00	4 12	4 42	4 20	4 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	-	1	1	2	7 7	13		1121/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	1	1		14		1365/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	4	5	14 13	4.29	897/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1 5	-	0	3 3	6 3		4.45	763/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	1	U	3	3	10	4.24	528/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	5	5	7	12	3.55	1064/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	9	11	3.79	1080/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	6	6	7	11	3.52	1177/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	7	3	4	4	11	3.31	784/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.31
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	2	2	0		****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	2	2	0		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work	4.0		•	_		•	_					4 0 -		
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102 University of Maryland Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 69

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2		
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	20								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0								
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0 Electives		Electives	0 #### - Means there are no			are not enough	t enough		
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	25	-		_			
				2	1								

Page 295

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103 University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County

Title Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 33

84-150

Grad.

0

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

4

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

G	~			
Student	Course	Evaluation	ı Ouestion	naire

Page 296

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

-																		
							Fre	eque	ncie	s		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 yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	2	2	11	10	8	3.61	1471/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.61
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	11	12	8	3.84	1279/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.84
		uestions reflec		_	0	1	2	3	10	10	7	3.53	1196/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53
	_	uations reflect		_	1	12	0	2	10	5	3	3.45	1421/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.45
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	2	2	2	10	9	6	3.52	1242/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.52
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	1	14	0	2	7	7	2	3.50	1266/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.50
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	1	0	0	1	9	13	9	3.94	1134/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.94
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	465/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	6	12	3	3.86	1105/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	6	12	13	4 23	1145/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19
					4	0	0	1	1	7	20		1165/1572		4.23	4.70		4.54
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clea					0	1	2	2	13			1100/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	3.99
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	2	0	5	8			1107/1559		3.79	4.29		3.91
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					4	4	2	5	6			1126/1352		3.60		3.86	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	8	0	6	1	13	2	3	2.80	1314/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.80
				ed to participate	8	0	2	1	12	6	4		1243/1382		3.84	4.29		3.36
		-	_	nd open discussion	8	0	4	3	11	3	4		1286/1368		3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00
		echniques succe			9	4	5	2	5	1			823/ 948			3.95	3.75	3.15
		Labora	torv															
1. Did th	ne lab ind		_	of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
			_	kground information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243		4.03	4.12	4.08	****
				for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
		structor provid			31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
		-		learly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Crodita E								D.	2000	a			m.	700			Majora	,
	rariiea	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке 	ason	.s 			Ту 	 be			Majors	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		_							1	, -				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 6		Gei	nera.	L				0	Under-g	rad 3	3	Non-	-major	30

Electives

Other

0

18

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103 University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County

Title Fall 2008 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 33

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

Page 297

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 110	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m thia acurac	0	0	2	2	11	10	8	2 61	1471/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.61
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	11	12	8		1279/1648		3.88	4.23	4.16	3.84
		lestions reflec			0	1	2	3	10	10	7		1196/1375		3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53
		uations reflect			1	12	0	2	10	5	3		1421/1595		3.74	4.20	4.03	3.45
				what you learned	2	2	2	2	10	9	6		1242/1533		3.69	4.04	3.87	3.52
				o what you learned	1	14	0	2	7	7	2		1266/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.50
		g system clearl			1	0	0	1	9	13	9		1134/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	3.94
		was class cand			3	0	0	0	0	2	28		465/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93
				ching effectiveness	12	1	1	1	15	3	0		1504/1621			4.06	3.96	3.66
		Lectur	е															
L. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	8	0	0	1	5	10	9	4.08	1243/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19
		ctor seem inter			11	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	1155/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54
				explained clearly	11	0	1	1	8	5	7	3.73	1311/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.99
		es contribute t			12	1	1	2	8	4	5		1370/1559		3.79	4.29	4.20	3.91
				our understanding	12	3	4	2	3	5	4	3.17	1189/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.30
		Discus	sion															
. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	6	1	13	2	3	2.80	1314/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.80
. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	8	0	2	1	12	6	4	3.36	1243/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.36
. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	8	0	4	3	11	3	4	3.00	1286/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00
. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	9	4	5	2	5	1	7	3.15	823/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.15
		Labora	tory															
. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa	nding o	of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
		structor provid			31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							R∈	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А б					or M			0	 Graduat		0	Mo i c		3
28-55	8		0	A 6 B 7		ĸe	quir	eu I	or M	a jor	5	U	Graduat	E	U	Majo	ŊĽ	3
		1.00-1.99	-	= :		<b>a</b>		1				^	TTrades		2	Mari		2.0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2			Ge	nera	Т				0	Under-g	raa 3	3	Non-	-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	2 0								0	шшпп	Maa	bar -			.lo
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		EI	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	111
						O+.	h				-	0	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcar	1L	
						Ut.	her				1	.8						
				? 0														

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103 University of Maryland

Page 298 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 GARRETT, TIM (Instr. C) Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment: 58

Ouestionnaires:	33	Student Cour	ree Evaluation	Questionnaire
Quescionnaires.	33	Scadelle Coal	Lac Evaluation	Quescionnaire

		0	_		NID	3.77	Fro	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	s 			NA						Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
l. Did you	gain n	ew insights,ski	lls from	n this course	0	0	2	2	11	10	8	3.61	1471/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.61
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	11	12	8	3.84	1279/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.84
	_	uestions reflec		1 0	0	1	2	3	10	10	7	3.53	1196/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53
		uations reflect			1	12	0	2	10	5	3	3.45	1421/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.45
				what you learned	2	2	2	2	10	9	6		1242/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.52
				what you learned	1	14	0	2	7	7	2		1266/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.50
		g system clearl		ined	1	0	0	1	9	13	9		1134/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.94
	-	was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	465/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93
. How wou	ld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	12	11	4.48	415/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66
		Lectur	е															
Were the	e instr	uctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	13	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	852/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19
. Did the	instru	ctor seem inter	ested ir	n the subject	12	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	1003/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54
. Was lec	ture ma	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	13	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	651/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.99
. Did the	lectur	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	13	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	832/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.91
. Did aud	iovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	16	4	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	1034/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.30
		Discus	sion															
. Did cla	ss disc	ussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	8	0	6	1	13	2	3	2.80	1314/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.80
				l to participate	8	0	2	1	12	6	4	3.36	1243/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.36
				d open discussion	8	0	4	3	11	3	4	3.00	1286/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00
		echniques succe		-	9	4	5	2	5	1	7	3.15	823/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.15
		Labora	torv															
. Did the	lab in	crease understa	_	the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
				ground information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	***
				or lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	***
		structor provid			31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	***
		nts for lab rep			31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	***
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits Ea:	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				R.e	ason	c c			Ту	ne			Majors	•
																		, 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6 B 7		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	3
28-55 56-83	8 2	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 2	B 7 C 6		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	3	Non-	major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		061	c.a	_				•	onder g	iuu J	5	1,011		50
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	<sub>i</sub> h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.8	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103 University of Maryland PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Baltimore County Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 299

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA		eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera			•			_			_					4 00		
		ew insights,ski			0	0	2	2	11	10	8		1471/164			4.28	4.11	3.61
		ctor make clear sestions reflect			1	0	0 2	1	11	12 10	8		1279/164		3.88	4.23	4.16	3.84
	_	ations reflect		1 3	1	1 12	0	2	10 10	5	7		1196/137 1421/159		3.57 3.74	4.27	4.10	3.53 3.45
				what you learned	2	2	2	2	10	9	5 6		1242/153		3.69	4.20	3.87	3.52
				o what you learned	1	14	0	2	7	9 7	2		1242/153		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.52
		g system clearly			1	14	0	1	9	13	9		1134/162		3.74	4.16	4.08	3.94
		was class cance	-	IIIea	3	0	0	0	0	2	28		465/164		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93
	-			hing effectiveness	12	0	0	2	11	8	0		1444/162			4.06	3.96	3.66
J. 110W WO	Julu you s	grade the overa.	ii ceac	ning effectiveness	12	U	U	2	11	O	U	3.23	1444/102	1 3.70	3.04	1.00	3.90	3.00
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	prepared	15	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1319/156	3 4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	14	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	1396/157	2 4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.54
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	15	0	0	2	7	4	5	3.67	1336/156	4 4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.99
		es contribute to			16	0	0	4	2	6	5	3.71	1308/155	9 4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.91
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	17	4	2	3	1	3	3	3.17	1189/135	2 3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.30
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	agg digg			what you learned	8	0	6	1	13	2	3	2 80	1314/138	4 3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	2.80
				d to participate	8	0	2	1	12	6			1243/138		3.84	4.29	4.03	3.36
				d open discussion	8	0	4	3	11	3	4		1286/136			4.30	4.01	3.00
		echniques succes		a open arbeabbion	9	4	5	2	5	1	7		823/ 94		3.50			3.15
	_	1																
		Labora	cory															
		crease understa	_		31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22		4.14	4.16	4.05	****
				ground information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 24		4.03	4.12	4.08	****
	_			or lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 21		4.30	4.40	4.43	****
		structor provide			31	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 20		4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were r	requiremer	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	5 4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	cribu	utic	n									
Credita F								P.e	ason	c			Tr.	уре			Majors	
	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad												<u>-</u>					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Gradua	te	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 6		Ger	neral	l				0	Under-	grad :	33	Non-	-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0		Means t				h
				P 0									respon	ses to l	oe sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.8						
				3 0														

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 27

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 300 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NΔ	Fre	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	8	8	3.81	1343/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	10		1010/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	10	8	3.88	1044/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	2	8	6		1285/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	8		1074/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	6	6	3		1214/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	8		4.19	883/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4		4.85	765/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	288/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	930/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	1096/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	651/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	695/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	6	4	11	4.14	607/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	5	4	3.11	1244/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	6	2	8		1057/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	4	2	4	5		1260/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	634/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.69
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	***	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0			****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25 19	0	0 1	0	0 1	2 1	0 5	4.00	****/ 209 377/ 555	**** 4.13	4.25 4.09	4.35 4.29	4.38 4.14	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	19	U		U			5	4.13	377/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	***	5.00	4.43	4.39	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	,	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	U	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	***

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 27

Baltimore County

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

# Frequency Distribution

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	0						

Page 300

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 27

HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 301 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	8	8	3.81	1343/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	10		1010/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	10	8		1044/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	2	8	6		1285/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	8		1074/1533	3.58	3.69		3.87	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	6	6	3		1214/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	8		4.19	883/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4		4.85	765/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	4	1	9	5	1	2.90	1535/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	2	2	6	9	2 72	1411/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	2	6	11		1411/1500	4.49	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	2	2	6	7		1360/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	3	1	5	6	4		1417/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	4	1	4	5	_		1138/1352	3.69	3.60			3.73
5. Did additivibual teelmiques elmanee your understanding	O	U	-	_	-	J	3	3.32	1130/1332	3.05	3.00	3.70	3.00	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	5	4	3.11	1244/1384	3.19	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	6	2	8	3.83	1057/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	4	2	4	5	3.22	1260/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	634/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.69
Laboratory						_								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25 19	0	0 1	0	0 1	2 1	0 5		****/ 209	**** 4.13	4.25	4.35	4.38 4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	U	1	U	Т	Т	5	4.13	377/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0			****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.70	4.16	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.10	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110	****		3.99		***
J. Here there enough proceeds for all the scudents	20	J	U	U	U	Τ.	U	Ŧ.00	/ 110		5.04	3.22	5.05	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 27 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 301 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	17	-			
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Title Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 52 Questionnaires: 27 Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 302 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	0	0	1	0	10	8	8	2 01	1343/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.81
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	1	0	1	0	3	12	10		1010/1648	4.01	3.88	4.28	4.11	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	10	8		1044/1375	3.83	3.57	4.23	4.10	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	2	8	6		1285/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	8		1074/1533		3.69	4.04	3.87	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	6	6	3		1214/1512	3.55	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	8		4.19	883/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22		765/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	4	9	3		1184/1621				3.96	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1326/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	1409/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	1127/1564	4.16	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	6	4	4		1221/1559		3.79	4.29		3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	860/1352	3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	5	4		1244/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	6	2	8		1057/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	4	2	4	5		1260/1368		3.63	4.30		3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	634/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.69
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	377/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.13
Seminar	0.5		•	•		_					4 00			
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	***	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26 26	0	0 0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	5.00 4.50	4.43 4.35	4.39 4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.54	***
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	20	U	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	~~~/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.34	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	3.82	3.99	3.83	***

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: DABEK, MARGARET (Instr. C)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 27 Fall 2008

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 302

52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	17	-		_	
				?	0						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 303 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	52
Questionnaires:	27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	8	8		1343/1649	3.87	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	12	10		1010/1648	4.01	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	10	8		1044/1375	3.83	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	2	8	6		1285/1595	3.64	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	8		1074/1533	3.58	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	6	6	3		1214/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	883/1623	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	765/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	5	7	4	3.76	1184/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1326/1568	4.26	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	4	6	8		1409/1572	4.49	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	1	3	5	5		1273/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	6	2	4		1400/1559	4.02	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62		3.69	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.73
Discussion		•	_	_	_	_						4 00		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	5	4		1244/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	6	2	8		1057/1382	3.79	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0 2	3 2	4 1	2 4	4	5 7		1260/1368	3.42	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	2	Т	4	2	/	3.69	634/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.69
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	377/ 555	4.13	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.13
Quantum and														
Seminar	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 00	****	4 22	4 54	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26 26	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 88 ****/ 85	****	4.33 5.00	4.54 4.47	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26 26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.47	4.30 4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.43	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
5. Here driveria for grading made crear	20	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	1.00	, 200		3.03	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.70	4.16	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	***
The state of the s		Ū	-	٥	Ŭ	-	•		, 110		02		00	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: JUODESKA, ROKAS (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 52

Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 303 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-			
				?	0						

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

20

Fall 2008

Page 304 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Tnsi	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	5		1142/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	521/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	823/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1027/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	614/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	302/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	635/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1332/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1031/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1096/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1096/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1088/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	792/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	616/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	948/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	1	0	2	1		601/ 948	3.81		3.95		3.75
Laboratory														
Laboratory	г	0	0	1	1	2	_	4 20	110/ 221	4 22	1 11	1 10	4 05	4 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5 5	0	0	1 0	1 1	3	5 6	4.20	118/ 221 65/ 243	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.20 4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5 5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.50 4.70	82/ 212		4.03	4.12 4.40	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5 5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	63/ 209	4.52 4.53	4.30 4.25	4.40	4.43 4.38	4.70 4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.70	338/ 555	4.30	4.25	4.33		4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 304 FEB 11, 2009 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	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	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	13	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: MESSENGER, TASH (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2008

Page 305 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1	General	0	0	0	_	4	_	_	4 07	1140/1640	2 70	2 06	4 00	4 11	4 07
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4 1	6 5	5 9	4.07	1142/1649 521/1648	3.78 3.95	3.96 3.88	4.28	4.11 4.16	4.07 4.53
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	823/1375	3.77	3.57	4.23	4.10	4.23
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	5		1027/1595	3.77	3.74	4.27	4.10	4.23
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	614/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.27
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	302/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.62
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	-	4.40	635/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.40
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4		4.38	535/1621	3.80	3.64		3.96	3.96
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	683/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.50
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	985/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.69
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	511/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.35
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	586/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.34
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	690/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.96
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.50
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	616/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.50
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2		4.00	948/1368		3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00
4.	Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.75
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	118/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.20
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	65/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.50
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	82/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.70
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	63/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.70
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	338/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.33
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: MESSENGER, TASH (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 305 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	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	13	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 306

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

																_	
		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean		Level Mean	Sec Mea
		General															
. Did vo	ou gain n		s from this course	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1429/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.6
		ctor make clear th		1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33			3.88	4.23	4.16	4.3
			the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	3	1		1071/137		3.57	4.27	4.10	3.8
		uations reflect th		1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/159		3.74	4.20	4.03	4.2
			to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00			3.69	4.04	3.87	4.
			ite to what you learned	. 1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	465/151	2 3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.
		g system clearly e		2	0	1	0	3	2	2		1387/162		3.84	4.16	4.08	3.
		was class cancel		1	0	1	0	0	2	6		1340/164		4.83	4.69	4.67	
	-		teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1175/162	1 3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.0
		Lecture															
. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures v	well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	1050/156	3 4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.0
			ted in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1365/157	2 4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.
			and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1127/156	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.
		es contribute to v		1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1206/155	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.
			nce your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	2	3		1025/135		3.60	3.98	3.86	3.
		Discussio	on														
. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute	e to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1081/138	4 3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.
			raged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1275/138	2 3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.
			ir and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1346/136	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.
		echniques successi		7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 94	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	**
		Laborato	cy														
. Did th	ne lab in	crease understand:	ing of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 22	1 4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.8
. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequate	background information	. 5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	58/ 24	3 4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.6
. Were n	necessary	materials availab	ole for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 21:	2 4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	5.0
. Did th	ne lab in	structor provide a	assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 20	9 4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	5.0
. Were r	requireme	nts for lab report	cs clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	282/ 55	5 4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.
			Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			T	/pe			Majors	3
 00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 ) A 7		 Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 s	0	Gradua	 -e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55	2		В 1		100	-1411	-Cu I	O1 1·10	المارة	~	Ü	Gradaa		~	٥		,
56-83	0				Ç۵	nera	1				1	Under-	rrad 1	.0	Non-	-major	1
34-150	0		1 D 0		GE	c. a					-	OTIGET -	jiuu 1		11011-		
	0				וים	eat i	WAS				1	####	Meane +	here -	are not	enous	۲h
JI au.	U	3.30-4.00			ъI	CCLI	ves				_						lit
			= *		0+	hor					7	respon	ses to t	e sigi	ııııdı	16	
					Ut	ner,					/						
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	L F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ecti her	ves.				7		Means t ses to b				19

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 307

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			1	0	1	1	1	3	3		1429/1649		3.96	4.28	4.11	3.67
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	797/1648		3.88	4.23	4.16	4.33
		uestions reflec			1	3	0	0	2	3	1		1071/1375		3.57	4.27	4.10	3.83
		uations reflect			1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1595		3.74	4.20	4.03	4.25
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	815/1533		3.69	4.04	3.87	4.00
				to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	,		3.72	4.10	3.86	4.44
		g system clearl		ained	2	0	1	0	3	2	2		1387/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	3.50
		was class cand			1	0	1	0	0	2	6		1340/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	687/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.01
		Lectur	е															
l. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1401/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.04
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	2	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1498/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.10
				explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1235/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	3.94
		es contribute t			2	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1336/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.76
				your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1090/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.49
		Discus	aion															
l Did al	aga diga			what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	Λ	2 E0	1081/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.50
				ed to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	0		1275/1382		3.84	4.29	4.03	3.25
				nd open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	1	0		1346/1368		3.63	4.30	4.03	2.50
		echniques succe		id Open discussion	7	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 948		3.50	3.95	3.75	****
i. Were b	peciai ce	eciniiques succe	SSIUI		,	۷	U	U	U	U		5.00	7 940	3.01	3.50	3.95	3.75	
		Labora	-															
				of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.80
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	58/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.60
. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	5.00
l. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assis	stance	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	5.00
. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	282/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.60
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 1				_										
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge:	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	ſh
				Р 0									respons	es to k	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					7						
				? 0														

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: 21

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Fall 2008

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 308

Questionnaires: 16	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Tns	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	2	1	5	6	2		1545/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	4		1347/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	882/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	5		1323/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	4	5		703/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	4	5		1062/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	4	4	2		1489/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4			977/1646		4.83	4.69		4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	U	1	4	5	2	3.67	1261/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1169/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1146/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	1001/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1121/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	607/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	948/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	2	2	7		1080/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	6	3		1181/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	3	5		249/ 948		3.50	3.95		4.44
1. Were special teciniques successivi	2	J	U	U	1	5	J	1.11	249/ 940	3.01	3.30	3.95	3.75	1.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	166/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	152/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	149/ 212		4.30	4.40	4.43	4.08
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	148/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	442/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	3.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	***	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	190/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	193/ 312		4.38	3.68	3.51	3.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 308 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	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	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	-			
				?	0						

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: OLESKE, JEFFREY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 16 Fall 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 309 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Conoral														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	6	2	3 31	1545/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	4		1347/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	882/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	1323/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	703/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1062/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	4	4	2	3.23	1489/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	977/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	374/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	3	7		1248/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	5	0	8		1453/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	4	7		1046/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	1	2	7		1258/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	644/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	948/1384		3.52	4.08	3.86	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	2	2	7		1080/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	6	3		1181/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	249/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.44
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	166/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	152/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	149/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.08
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	148/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	442/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	3.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 81	***	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13 12	0	0	1	1 2	1 2	0	3.00	****/ 92 190/ 288	**** 3.50	4.50 3.83	4.35	4.01 3.54	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	12	U	U	U	2	۷	U	3.50	190/ 200	3.50	3.03	3.00	3.34	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	3.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.07	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.07	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: OLESKE, JEFFREY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16

CHEMISTRY LAB I Baltimore County
, JEFFREY (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Page 309 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	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	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 310

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 6

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 1 0 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 1027/1649 3.78 3.96 4.28 4.11 4.20 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 0 1 0 3 3.80 1313/1648 3.95 3.88 4.23 4.16 3.80 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 1243/1375 3.77 3.57 4.27 4.10 3.40 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 1 1 3.20 1499/1595 3.77 3.74 4.20 4.03 3.20 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 1065/1533 3.89 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 1 2 3.80 1089/1512 3.94 3.72 4.10 3.86 3.80 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 1 1 0 1 0 2 3.50 1387/1623 3.51 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 1 0 0 0 4 4.20 1440/1646 4.79 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.20 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 374/1621 3.80 3.64 4.06 3.96 3.88 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 731/1568 4.10 4.13 4.43 4.39 3.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 1146/1572 4.30 4.23 4.70 4.64 3.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 780/1564 4.03 3.90 4.28 4.20 3.80 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 2 2 4.00 1121/1559 3.86 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.70 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 690/1352 3.78 3.60 3.98 3.86 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 795/1384 3.69 3.52 4.08 3.86 4.00 1 4.00 946/1382 3.64 3.84 4.29 4.03 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 0 1 0 1 4.00 948/1368 3.51 3.63 4.30 4.01 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 431/948 3.81 3.50 3.95 3.75 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 221 4.32 4.14 4.16 4.05 5.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 243 4.42 4.03 4.12 4.08 5.00 1/ 212 4.52 4.30 4.40 4.43 5.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 209 4.53 4.25 4.35 4.38 5.00 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 293/555 4.30 4.09 4.29 4.14 4.50 Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401 University of Maryland INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: NGUYEN, DUONG (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 6 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 311

_				
Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ougetionn	aira
bludelil	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescroilli	атте

	Frequencies					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	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1027/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	0	3		1313/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	1		1243/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1499/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1065/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1089/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1387/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1440/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1451/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1515/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	0	1		1556/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1472/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1408/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	795/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	946/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	948/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.50
The state of the s	_	-	-	-	-	_	_		22, 233					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Туре			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	_		
				2	0						

University of Maryland

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 20

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 312 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	8	5	3	3.44	1513/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	4	5	6		1408/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	1	3	2	5		1112/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	6	3	4		1430/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	8	1			1126/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	8	2	4	3.71	1143/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	1	5			1442/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	697/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	4	10	1	3.44	1381/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1257/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	2	11		1241/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	3	1	10		1010/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	3	2	7		1315/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	3	3	3	7		836/1352			3.98		4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1122/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	2	1		1069/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	3	0		1206/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 948	3.81			3.75	****
Laboratory	0	0	•	0	0	0	_	4 50	64/ 001	4 20	4 1 4	4 16	4 05	4 50
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	64/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	91/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.42
<ol> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> </ol>	8	0	0	0	4 0	3 4		4.08	149/ 212 72/ 209	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8 8	0	0	1	2	4	8 5	4.67 4.08	381/ 555	4.53 4.30	4.25 4.09	4.35 4.29	4.38 4.14	4.67 4.08
J. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	O	U	U		2	1	J	1.00	301/ 333	4.50	4.05	1.27	1,11	4.00
Seminar					•	_		4 00					4 01	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	U	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	***

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 312 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Туре	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	2						

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 313 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre 1	equer 2	ncie	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	2	0	1	1	8	5	3	3.44	1513/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1408/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	1	3	2	5		1112/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	6	3	4		1430/1595		3.74	4.20	4.03	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	8	1	6		1126/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	8	2	4		1143/1512		3.72	4.10	3.86	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	1	5	6		1442/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	697/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	11	2	3.88	1087/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	3	5		1080/1568		4.13	4.43	4.39	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	3	2	5		1419/1572		4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	2		4.40	780/1564		3.90	4.28	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	1			1206/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	495/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1122/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1069/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	3	0		1206/1368		3.63	4.30	4.01	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	64/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	91/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	149/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.08
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	72/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	381/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 313 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	2						

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

24

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Fall 2008

Page 314 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
	NR 													
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	7	7	3		1524/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	7	5	6		1415/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	3	3	7	2		1196/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	3	5	4	6		1300/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1		1 0	1	4	4	7		935/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1 0	1	1 5	8 7	6 5	4		1159/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	2 1	1	0	1	0	0	1 18		1533/1623 765/1646	3.51 4.79	3.84 4.83	4.16 4.69	4.08 4.67	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	7	7			1310/1621				3.96	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3		U	_	,	,	2	3.39	1310/1021	3.00	3.04	4.00	3.90	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	3	8	5	3.79	1391/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	1346/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	8	4		1328/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	5	5	3		1420/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	842/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	3	1	3 43	1113/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	4	1	1		1265/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	2	2	1		1276/1368		3.63	4.30	4.01	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	2			****/ 948	3.81			3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	3	1	1		****/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	2	2	1		****/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	1	2	1		****/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.00	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.02	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 312		4.38	3.68	3.51	****
J. Did conferences help for early out litera detivities	20	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	_	Ü	1.00	, 312	3.73	1.30	3.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20 20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	***	3.82	3.99	3.83	***

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 314 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned 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	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	1						

21011. CHEM 1020 0001

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: GUEI, JULES (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 315 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Erc	miar	ncies			Tnat	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Laval	Sect
Questions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	7	7	3	3.40	1524/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	7	5	6		1415/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	3	3	7	2		1196/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	3	5	4	6		1300/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	4		3.88	935/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	8	6			1159/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	7	5	_		1533/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	0	_		765/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	3	6			1319/1621			4.06		3.58
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	U	4		J	U	-	3.30	1319/1021	3.00	3.01	1.00	3.90	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1252/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	7	6		1439/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	6	3		1368/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	3	3	_		1277/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	2	3	_	4.22	534/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	4.04
J. Did additivibual teeliniques ciniance your understanding	,	5	O	U	2	5	_	1.22	331/1332	3.70	3.00	3.70	3.00	1.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1113/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	4	1	1		1265/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	2	2	1		1276/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	2	1		****/ 948	3.81			3.75	****
									, -					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20 20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

GUEI, JULES (Instr. B) Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 315 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

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

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 316 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluat	cion	Questior	ınaire
---------	--------	---------	------	----------	--------

Questions					NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights, skills from	om this course	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1371/1	649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.77
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	4	6	3		1208/1		3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.92
		uestions reflect the	-	0	6	0	1	3	2	1		1236/1		3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.43
	_	uations reflect the e	_	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1067/1	595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contribute to	what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1045/1	533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.78
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contribute	to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1191/1	512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.63
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly expl	ained	1	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1462/1	623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.33
		was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1		4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1375/1	621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.68
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1279/1	568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.19
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1034/1	572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1403/1	564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.95
		es contribute to what	-	0	0 2	3 1	0	3	4	3	3.31	1432/1	559	3.86		4.29	4.20	3.65
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						2	3	3	2	3.27	1153/1	352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.51
		Discussion																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1011/1	384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.67
		nts actively encourage		7	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1216/1	382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.50
		ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	948/1	368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques successful		7	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	****
		Laboratory																
		crease understanding		3	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	129/	221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.00
_	_	ded with adequate bac	_	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30		243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.30
	_	materials available		3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	28/		4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.90
		structor provide assi		3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	45/		4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.80
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab reports c	learly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	293/	555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.50
		Seminar																
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant to the	e announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
		Field Work																
1. Did fi	.eld expe	rience contribute to	what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
		Self Paced																
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00.07		0.00.0.00									1							
00-27 28-55	0 5	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 1 B 8		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ıjor	5	1	Grad	uate	E	0	Majo	)T.	0
	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 2						1				0	Unde:	r-a	rad 1	L3	Non	-major	13
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D 0					GC.	nera					U	onde	- 91	Luu 1		INOII-	a JUI	Τ.)
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Electives				0 #### - Means there are not eno				enous	rh				
91ad. 0 3.30 4.00 2 P 0				FIECCIAED								es to k			_	•		
I O					Other					1	.0	-			3			
1 0						Other												

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: OLESKE, JEFFREY (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 317 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 13 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 0 0 0 2 3 4 4 3.77 1371/1649 3.78 3.96 4.28 4.11 3.77 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 3 4 4 3.77 1371/1649 3.78 3.96 4.28 4.11 3.77 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 6 3 3.92 1208/1648 3.95 3.88 4.23 4.16 3.92 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 1 3 2 1 3.43 1236/1375 3.77 3.57 4.27 4.10 3.43 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 4 5 4.00 1067/1595 3.77 3.74 4.20 4.03 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 1 1 1 2 4 3.78 1045/1533 3.89 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.78 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 1 2 4 1  $3.63\ 1191/1512\ 3.94\ 3.72\ 4.10\ 3.86\ 3.63$ 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 5 3 2 3.33 1462/1623 3.51 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.33 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1646 4.79 4.83 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 1 7 2 3.91 1060/1621 3.80 3.64 4.06 3.96 3.68 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 1012/1568 4.10 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.19 5 0 0 0 3 2 3 4.00 1463/1572 4.30 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.35 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 754/1564 4.03 3.90 4.28 4.20 3.95 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 1121/1559 3.86 3.79 4.29 4.20 3.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 2 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 914/1352 3.78 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.51 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 0 4 1 3.67 1011/1384 3.69 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 1216/1382 3.64 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 948/1368 3.51 3.63 4.30 4.01 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 4 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 3.81 3.50 3.95 3.75 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 0 1 1 5 3 4.00 129/221 4.32 4.14 4.16 4.05 4.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 117/243 4.42 4.03 4.12 4.08 4.30 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 28/212 4.52 4.30 4.40 4.43 4.90 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 45/209 4.53 4.25 4.35 4.38 4.80 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 293/555 4.30 4.09 4.29 4.14 4.50 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.54 4.31 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* 3.25 4.06 3.72 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 3.70 4.30 4.17 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				2	Ω						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Ouestionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 318 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 912/1649 3.78 3.96 4.28 4.11 4.31 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 1010/1648 3.95 3.88 4.23 4.16 4.15 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 6 4 4.08 925/1375 3.77 3.57 4.27 4.10 4.08 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 722/1595 3.77 3.74 4.20 4.03 4.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 5 4 3 3.83 986/1533 3.89 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 1 1 7 3 4.00 883/1512 3.94 3.72 4.10 3.86 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 4 5 3 3.77 1264/1623 3.51 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.77 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 531/1646 4.79 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 1345/1621 3.80 3.64 4.06 3.96 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 0 1 4 6 4.17 1191/1568 4.10 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.45 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 10 4.67 1071/1572 4.30 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.54 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 1 3 7 4.25 939/1564 4.03 3.90 4.28 4.20 4.49 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 2 2 7 4.00 1121/1559 3.86 3.79 4.29 4.20 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 1 4 3 4 3.83 860/1352 3.78 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.92 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 3 3 0 3.50 1081/1384 3.69 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 2 2 2 0 3.00 1316/1382 3.64 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 3 0 3.60 1143/1368 3.51 3.63 4.30 4.01 3.60 4. Were special techniques successful 8 1 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 431/948 3.81 3.50 3.95 3.75 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 45/221 4.32 4.14 4.16 4.05 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 27/243 4.42 4.03 4.12 4.08 4.80 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  $8 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 5 \quad 4.83 \quad 40/ \ 209 \quad 4.53 \quad 4.25 \quad 4.35 \quad 4.38 \quad 4.83$ 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/555 4.30 4.09 4.29 4.14 5.00 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 3.50 3.83 3.68 3.54 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Credits Earned 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 13 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 P 0 responses to be significant

Other

I 0

? 0

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

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Title Instructor: MESSENGER, TASH (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 14

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 319 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 912/1649 3.78 3.96 4.28 4.11 4.31 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 1010/1648 3.95 3.88 4.23 4.16 4.15 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 6 4 4.08 925/1375 3.77 3.57 4.27 4.10 4.08 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 722/1595 3.77 3.74 4.20 4.03 4.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 5 4 3 3.83 986/1533 3.89 3.69 4.04 3.87 3.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 1 1 7 3 4.00 883/1512 3.94 3.72 4.10 3.86 4.007. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 4 5 3 3.77 1264/1623 3.51 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.77 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 531/1646 4.79 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 374/1621 3.80 3.64 4.06 3.96 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 535/1568 4.10 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.45 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 2 3 7 4.42 1313/1572 4.30 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.54 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 390/1564 4.03 3.90 4.28 4.20 4.49 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 549/1559 3.86 3.79 4.29 4.20 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2 0 0 4 1 4 4.00 690/1352 3.78 3.60 3.98 3.86 3.92 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 3 3 0 3.50 1081/1384 3.69 3.52 4.08 3.86 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 2 2 2 0 3.00 1316/1382 3.64 3.84 4.29 4.03 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 2 3 0  $3.60\ 1143/1368\ 3.51\ 3.63\ 4.30\ 4.01\ 3.60$ 4. Were special techniques successful 8 1 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 431/948 3.81 3.50 3.95 3.75 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 45/ 221 4.32 4.14 4.16 4.05 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 27/ 243 4.42 4.03 4.12 4.08 4.80 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 43/212 4.52 4.30 4.40 4.43 4.83 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 40/209 4.53 4.25 4.35 4.38 4.83 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/555 4.30 4.09 4.29 4.14 5.00 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 3.50 3.83 3.68 3.54 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

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

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2008

Page 320 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.exre1	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΙΔ	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	5	2	8	4.00	1183/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1254/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1071/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1295/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	885/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	849/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1308/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	4	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1385/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1212/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	2			1336/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1362/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	6	1	2	3.18	1183/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.37
Discussion					_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	5	2		1159/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	6	1	2		1316/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	4	2	1		1339/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	163/ 221	4.32	1 11	1 16	4.05	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	3 1	4	4.29			4.14	4.16		4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	_	4.29	121/ 243 130/ 212	4.42 4.52	4.03	4.12 4.40	4.08 4.43	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	1	1		4.14	146/ 209	4.52	4.25	4.40	4.43	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	438 / 555	4.30	4.25	4.35	4.36	3.86
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	,	U	U	U	-	U	J	3.00	430/ 333	1.50	4.00	1.27	1.11	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced				_	•						0 56	4 0 5		
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	^ ~ * * *	3.82	3.99	3.83	^ ^ * *

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 320 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: Enrollment:

ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)

19 Questionnaires: 16 Fall 2008

Page 321 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	;		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	5	2	8		1183/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5		1254/1648	3.95	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	3	5		1071/1375	3.77	3.57	4.27	4.10	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	5	4		1295/1595	3.77	3.74		4.03	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9		3.94	,	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	849/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	5	4		1308/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1060/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.70
T														
Lecture	2	0	0	0	4	1	_	4 00	1040/1560	4 10	1 12	4 42	4 20	2 04
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	4	5 7		1248/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43		3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	-	0	3	3			1384/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	1	7		1028/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0 4	0	0 1	2 4	4		4.38	851/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	U	Τ	4	2	2	3.56	1025/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	5	2	3.33	1159/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	6	1	2		1316/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	4	2	1		1339/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	844/ 948		3.50	3.95		3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	163/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	121/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	130/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	146/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	438/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	3.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 288	3.50	3.83	3.68		****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	U		U	U	U	U	1.00	200	3.50	3.03	3.00	3.34	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	3.75	4.38	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30		****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	3.83	****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment:

ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 16

19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 321 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001 University of Maryland Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 322

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	_	2	2	2 (1	1450/1649	3.78	3.96	4 20	4.11	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5 5	2	3		1304/1648	3.78	3.88	4.28	4.11	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	2	2		1208/1375	3.77	3.57	4.23	4.10	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	1	2		1487/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.03	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2	3		1159/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	2		1186/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	3	2		1480/1623	3.51	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1381/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1347/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	3		1422/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	3		1219/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	1359/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	942/1352	3.78	3.60	3.98	3.86	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	937/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	831/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	645/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	188/ 243	4.42	4.03	4.12	4.08	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	188/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	186/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	388/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.00

Credits E	arned				Grades	Reasons		Type	Majo	ſS
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate (	0 Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General		Under-grad 11	1 Non-majo	c 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	here are not eno	agh
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	6			
				?	0					

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 323

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: NGUYEN, DUONG (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 11

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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	E	2	2	2 61	1450/1649	3.78	3.96	4.28	4.11	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	2		1304/1648	3.76	3.88	4.23	4.16	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	2	2		1208/1375	3.77	3.57	4.23	4.10	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	1	2		1487/1595	3.77	3.74	4.20	4.10	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	2	2		1159/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	2	2		1186/1512	3.94	3.72	4.10	3.86	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	3	2		1480/1512	3.94	3.74	4.10	4.08	3.04
3 3 1 1 1		0	0	0	0	0	2 11	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.16		5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0 3	0	0	1	3	3			,				4.67	3.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	Τ	3	3	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.80	3.64	4.06	3.96	3.4/
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1401/1568	4.10	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	2		1442/1572	4.30	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	1		1352/1564	4.03	3.90	4.28	4.20	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	2		1277/1559	3.86	3.79	4.29	4.20	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	2	2	0		1177/1352		3.60	3.98	3.86	3.46
5. Did additivibual econniques chiance your anderseanding	-	_	Ü	_	-	-	Ü	3.20	11///1552	3.70	3.00	3.70	3.00	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	937/1384	3.69	3.52	4.08	3.86	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	831/1382	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1368	3.51	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	645/ 948	3.81	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 221	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.05	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	Ţ		1	3.75	188/ 243	4.32		4.16	4.05	3.75
	7	-	0	0	2	1	1	3.75			4.03			
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0		T	1		188/ 212	4.52	4.30	4.40	4.43	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	3 2	0	1		186/ 209	4.53	4.25	4.35	4.38	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	U	U	۷	1	2	4.00	388/ 555	4.30	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.00
Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

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

Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM

Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON

Enrollment: 88
Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 324 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	12	22	4.45	723/1649	4.45	3.96	4.28	4.11	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	26	4.55	498/1648	4.55	3.88	4.23	4.16	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	12	21	4.34	723/1375	4.34	3.57	4.27	4.10	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	451/1595	4.55	3.74	4.20	4.03	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	4	2	6	15	4.07	768/1533	4.07	3.69	4.04	3.87	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	3.86	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	8	28	4.66	333/1623	4.66	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	865/1646	4.78	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	13	18	4.44	456/1621	4.44	3.64	4.06	3.96	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	876/1572	4.78	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	28	4.73	390/1564	4.73	3.90	4.28	4.20	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	4	31	4.81	318/1559	4.81	3.79	4.29	4.20	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	3	1	5	3	5	3.35	1122/1352		3.60	3.98	3.86	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	2	_	13	4.43	520/1384	4.43	3.52	4.08	3.86	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	749/1382	4.37	3.84	4.29	4.03	4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	449/1368	4.74	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	20	14	0	1	1	1	2		****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.75	****
			-	_	_	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.14	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt i or	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 30

Baltimore County FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Fall 2008

Page 325 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1156/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1464/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	7	1	7	3.40	1243/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	462/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1362/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	6	4	3.45	1410/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	9	5	3	3.50	1345/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	5	11		1205/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6		4.62	1133/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	2	11	4		1368/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	0	2	5	9	3.75	1277/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	2	1	1	8	3.79	893/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
Laboratory	_		•		_	_			55 / OO4	4 40			4 0=	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	57/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	65/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2		4.88	34/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	121/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	388/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00
Seminar														
	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	1 22	4 54	1 (2	****
<ol> <li>Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	20 19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.33	4.54 4.35	4.63 4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	19	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.50	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.02	4.47	4.43	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
J. Did conferences help you early out little detrivities	20	O	O	U	O	O	_	3.00	/ 512		1.50	3.00	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 110	****		3.99	4.05	****
	-	-	-	-		-	-		, .=-					

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 325 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	С	7	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
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	19	-		_	
				?	2						

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor:

MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 21

Page 326 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	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	0	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1156/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1464/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	7	1	7	3.40	1243/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	462/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1362/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	6	4	3.45	1410/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	8	4	3.89	1078/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	815/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1384/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	887/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1231/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	57/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	65/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2		4.88	34/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	121/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	388/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29		4.00
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
	10	O	Ü	Ü	Ü	U	2	3.00	, 200		3.03	3.00	3.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 326 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_		_	
				?	2						

SCIOII: CHEM 300 0101

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor:

KISER, JOHN (Instr. C)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 327 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	30
Ouestionnaires:	21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eguer	ncies	5		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	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1156/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1464/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	7	1	7	3.40	1243/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	462/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	1362/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	6	4	3.45	1410/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	914/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1243/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	1406/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	5	4		1127/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1322/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	10	U	U	U	_	U	_	1.00	/1300		3.03	1.30	1.32	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	57/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	65/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	34/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	121/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	388/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.58	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****
1 Shore disagn process for all the beateness	_0	J	,	3	_	,	J	2.00	, 110		3.02	2.77	1.05	

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 327 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

ollment: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	2						

30

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: Enrollment:

KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. D)

Job IRBR3029

Page 328 FEB 11, 2009

#### Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	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	0	0	0	2	4	6	9		1156/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	5		1464/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	7	1	7		1243/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	2	9		462/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	4	4			1362/1533		3.69	4.04	4.05	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	0			1035/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	6			1410/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	777/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	4	6	4 33	1050/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	1	5	6		1406/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	4	5		1028/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	1	3	2			1277/1559		3.79	4.29		3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	2	0	0	0	1		****/1352	3.07		3.98	3.97	
o, bia addio, ibadi ocominques cimanos your andersounding			_	Ü	Ü	Ū	_	2.55	, 1002	3.07	3.00	3.70	3.7	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
T alassah aura														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	57/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	3 4	10	4.50	65/ 243			4.10	3.89	4.50
	5 5	0	0	0	0	_		4.88	34/ 212		4.03	4.12	4.21	4.88
<ol> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> </ol>	5 5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.88	121/ 209		4.30	4.40	4.12	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5 5	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.38	388/ 555	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	U	U	2	4	2	8	4.00	388/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
ni di mada														
Field Work	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** LO	****	2 25	1 00	2 50	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -		3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****
	-	-	-	-		-	-		, .=-					

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 328 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-		_	
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 28

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 329

							Ere	201121	ncies			Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank		_	Mean		Mean
		Genera																
-	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	3	4	8	13		1116/1649		3.96	4.28	4.27	4.11
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	7	8	10		1237/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.89
	_	uestions reflec		_	0	0	2	6	6	7	7		1245/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.39
		uations reflect			0	8	0	2	4	5	9		1038/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.05
	_	-		what you learned	0	10	1	4	2	7	4		1249/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.50
		-		o what you learned	0	13	0	1	2	4	8		675/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.27
	_	g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	4	7	3	14		1089/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.96
	-	was class canc		1. 55	0	0	1	0	0	0	27	4.86	-, -	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overa	II tead	hing effectiveness	9	0	0	3	7	6	3	3.47	1363/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.72
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	2	0	3	2	20	4.41	983/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.26
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	3	3	21		1071/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.44
				explained clearly	1	0	1	3	7	4	12		1246/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.04
		es contribute t		-	1	1	2	1	7	3	13	3.92	1181/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	4	6	1	2	2	11	3.50	1049/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.56
		-	_	_														
		Discus																
				what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	3		****/1384	***	3.52	4.08	4.11	***
		-	_	d to participate	24	0	1	0	0	0	3		****/1382	***	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
		_		d open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	0	2		****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	***
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		24	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	of the material	8	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	110/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.25
				ground information	8	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	128/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.25
_	_	_		or lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	65/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.75
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	8	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	99/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.55
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	8	0	3	1	3	2	11	3.85	438/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.85
		Semina	70															
1 Were as	ssianed t			announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
				lividual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
				what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
	_	ons contribute		-	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
_		for grading mad		-	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
J		or grading mad	0 01001		_,	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 200		3.03	3.00	3.30	
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 9								0	 Graduat		0	 Мо - с		3
00-27 28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 9 B 9		Kee	quir(	eu ro	or Ma	Jor	ö	U	Graduat	C	U	Majo	)T	3
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	8	Non-	-major	25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			a	_				-	011401 9		-	1.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
	-		•	P 0									respons				_	, -
				I O		Ot]	her				2	3		~				
				? 3														
				: 3														

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102 University of Maryland

CAL CHEMISTRY Baltimore County

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 31
Ouestionnaires: 28

_			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Fall 2008

Page 330

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 4 8 13 4.11 1116/1649 3.93 3.96 4.28 4.27 4.11 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 7 8 10 3.89 1237/1648 3.71 3.88 4.23 4.18 3.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 2 6 6 7 7 3.39 1245/1375 3.45 3.57 4.27 4.22 3.39 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 2 4 5 9 4.05 1038/1595 4.25 3.74 4.20 4.21 4.05 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10 1 4 2 7 4 3.50 1249/1533 3.41 3.69 4.04 4.05 3.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 675/1512 4.05 3.72 4.10 4.11 4.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 4 7 3 14 3.96 1089/1623 3.65 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.96 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 0 0 0 27 4.86 748/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 0 5 9 5 4.00 914/1621 3.71 3.64 4.06 4.02 3.72 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 2 1 2 2 11 4.06 1257/1568 4.17 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.26 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 0 1 2 3 11 4.41 1313/1572 4.29 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.44 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 2 0 3 3 11 4.11 1083/1564 3.89 3.90 4.28 4.25 4.04 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 11 0 2 1 4 3 7 3.71 1308/1559 3.70 3.79 4.29 4.23 3.79 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 9 1 1 1 2 3 3.63 991/1352 3.07 3.60 3.98 3.97 3.56 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 3.52 4.08 4.11 \*\*\*\* 0 0 3 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 3.84 4.29 4.37 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 3.50 \*\*\*\*/1368 \*\*\*\* 3.63 4.30 4.39 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 1 4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 1 2 4 12 4.25 110/221 4.43 4.14 4.16 4.07 4.25 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 0 4 3 12 4.25 128/243 4.32 4.03 4.12 3.89 4.25 65/ 212 4.80 4.30 4.40 4.21 4.75 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  $8 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 3 \quad 16 \quad 4.75$ 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 99/ 209 4.21 4.25 4.35 4.12 4.55 8 0 1 0 1 3 15 4.55 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 3 1 3 2 11 3.85 438/555 4.03 4.09 4.29 4.22 3.85 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.54 4.63 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.55 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.43 4.30 \*\*\*\* 27 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.35 4.46 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 27 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* / 288 \*\*\*\* 3.83 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 3 1.00-1.99 0 В 28-55 0 9 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 4 0 General Under-grad 28 Non-major 25 84-150 D 0 3.00-3.49 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 23

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

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Baltimore County KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. C) Fall 2008

Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARL Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 331

FEB 11, 2009

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain nev	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	3	4	8	13	4.11	1116/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.11
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	3	7	8	10		1237/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.89
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	2	6	6	7	7	3.39	1245/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.39
4. Did oth	ner evalua	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	8	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1038/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.05
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	10	1	4	2	7	4	3.50	1249/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.50
		-		o what you learned	0	13	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	675/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.27
		system clearl		ined	0	0	0	4	7	3	14		1089/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.96
		was class cand			0	0	1	0	0	0	27	4.86	-,	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.86
9. How wou	ıld you gı	rade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	9	0	0	1	7	9	2	3.63	1281/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.72
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	14	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	1096/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.26
		tor seem inter			12	0	0	1	2	5	8		1400/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.44
				explained clearly	14	0	0	0	4	3	7		981/1564		3.90	4.28	4.25	4.04
		s contribute t			15	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1226/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79
				our understanding	15	8	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.56
1 5 1	3.1	Discus			0.4	0	-	0	0	_	2	4 00	**** /1204	ale ale ale ale	2 50	4 00	4 11	****
				what you learned	24	0	1 1	0	0	0	3		****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
				ed to participate	24	0	1	-	0 1	0	3		****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
		chniques succe		nd open discussion	24 24	2	1	0	0	0	2 1		****/1368 ****/ 948	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were Sp	pecial ted	cilitques succe	SSIUI		24	4		U	U	U		3.00	7 940		3.30	3.95	4.00	
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding c	of the material	8	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	110/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	8	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	128/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.25
	_			for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	65/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.75
		tructor provid			8	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	99/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.55
5. Were re	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	8	0	3	1	3	2	11	3.85	438/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.85
		Semina	r															
1 Were as	ssianed to			announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
	_	-		lividual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
				what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
	_	ns contribute		_	27	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
_		or grading mad		-	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	 1	0 00-0 00	0	 A 9								0	Cradust		0	. — — — — . Мо і с		3
28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 9 B 9		Ke	quire	eu I	or Ma	Jor	ö	U	Graduat	=	U	Majo	JΤ	3
26-55 56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	Б 9 С 4		Ge:	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad ?	8	Non-	-major	25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Ge.	ııcı a.	_				J	onder-g	Lau 2	J	14011-	ma JUI	۷.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		E.T.	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
0100.	Ŭ	3.33 1.00		P 0								_	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot:	her				2	3		~			-	
				? 3														

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102 University of Maryland FEB 11, 2009 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY Baltimore County

Instructor: MANNING, STEVEN (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 31 Ouestionnaires: 28

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 332

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 4 8 13 4.11 1116/1649 3.93 3.96 4.28 4.27 4.11 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3 7 8 10 3.89 1237/1648 3.71 3.88 4.23 4.18 3.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 2 6 6 7 7 3.39 1245/1375 3.45 3.57 4.27 4.22 3.39 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 2 4 5 9 4.05 1038/1595 4.25 3.74 4.20 4.21 4.05 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10 1 4 2 7 4 3.50 1249/1533 3.41 3.69 4.04 4.05 3.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 675/1512 4.05 3.72 4.10 4.11 4.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 4 7 3 14 3.96 1089/1623 3.65 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.96 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 0 0 0 27 4.86 748/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 0 7 9 3 3.79 1167/1621 3.71 3.64 4.06 4.02 3.72 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 1 0 2 2 9 4.29 1096/1568 4.17 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.26 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 1 0 1 3 11 4.44 1297/1572 4.29 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.44 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 1 0 3 3 6 4.00 1127/1564 3.89 3.90 4.28 4.25 4.04 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 15 0 2 0 4 1 6 3.69 1311/1559 3.70 3.79 4.29 4.23 3.79 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 8 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 \*\*\*\*/1352 3.07 3.60 3.98 3.97 3.56 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 3.52 4.08 4.11 \*\*\*\* 0 0 3 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 3.84 4.29 4.37 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 3.50 \*\*\*\*/1368 \*\*\*\* 3.63 4.30 4.39 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 1 4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 1 2 4 12 4.25 110/221 4.43 4.14 4.16 4.07 4.25 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 0 4 3 12 4.25 128/243 4.32 4.03 4.12 3.89 4.25 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 65/212 4.80 4.30 4.40 4.21 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  $8 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 3 \quad 15 \quad 4.55$ 99/ 209 4.21 4.25 4.35 4.12 4.55 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 3 1 3 2 11 3.85 438/555 4.03 4.09 4.29 4.22 3.85 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.54 4.63 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.55 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.43 4.30 \*\*\*\* 27 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.35 4.46 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 27 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* / 288 \*\*\*\* 3.83 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors Graduate 0 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Major 1.00-1.99 0 В 28-55 0 9 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 4 0 General Under-grad 28 Non-major 25 84-150 D 0 3.00-3.49 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant Ι 0 Other 23 ?

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 22

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 333 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Title Baltimore County Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A) Fall 2008

			Fr	eque	ncies	\$		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	4	4	6	7	3 64	1450/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	8		1395/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	9		1192/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	916/1595		3.74	4.20	4.21	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	1	1	8		1269/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	0	2	9	4.00	883/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1379/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	2	3	7	3	3.16	1475/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	1	13	4.24	1137/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	1193/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	4	5	6		1431/1564		3.90	4.28	4.25	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	3	0	8		1458/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	3	3	1	10	3.60	1002/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	0	0		****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/1382	***	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	71/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	135/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	62/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40		4.76
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	2	3	1	3	8	3.71	175/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35		3.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24
Seminar								4 00			4 00			
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
Field Work	0.0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0.00	****/ <b>-</b> ^	****	2 25	4 06	2 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39		5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	8 8 8 8
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
		-	_	-	-	U	U	1.00	/ 53		3.70	1.30	7.34	
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	рe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected (	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0		5 -	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0		5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C '	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D (	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F (	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P (	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I (	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

-Section: CHEM 300 0104

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

0

0

Grad.

Instructor: MANO
Enrollment: 30

MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. B)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 334 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Questionnaires: 22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
--------------------	-----------------------------------------

	Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Se Me
	General														
. Did you gain n	new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1450/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.
. Did the instru	ctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	4	8	3.68	1395/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.
. Did the exam q	questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	9	3.55	1192/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.
Did other eval	uations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	916/1595	4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.
Did assigned r	readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	1	1	8	3.47	1269/1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.
Did written as	ssignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	0	2	9	4.00	883/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4
Was the gradin	ng system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1379/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3
How many times	was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5
How would you	grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	5	6	6	3.74	1209/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3
	Lecture														
Were the instr	ructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1205/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	3
	actor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1500/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4
	terial presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	3	6	4		1306/1564		3.90	4.28	4.25	3
	res contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	3	0	2			1277/1559		3.79	4.29	4.23	3
	l techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1323/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	2
	Discussion														
Did class disc	cussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	*
	ents actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	*
	actor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1368	***	3.63	4.30	4.39	*
	Laboratory														
Did the lab in	crease understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	71/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4
Were you provi	ded with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	135/ 243	4.32	4.03	4.12	3.89	4
Were necessary	materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	62/ 212	4.80	4.30	4.40	4.21	4
Did the lab in	structor provide assistance	4	1	2	3	1	3	8	3.71	175/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	3
Were requireme	ents for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4
	Seminar														
Were assigned	topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	*
	Field Work														
_	rience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	*
Did you clearl	y understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	*
Was the instru	ctor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	*
To what degree	e could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	***	5.00	4.38	4.32	*
	Self Paced														
Did self-paced	system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	*
	Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
 00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	 jor		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
8-55 1	1.00-1.99 0 B 5			-			-						3 -		
6-83 2	2.00-2.99 1 C 7		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	2	Non-	-major	
4-150 6	3.00-3.49 3 D 0														

Electives

19

Other

Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 22

KISER, JOHN (Instr. C)

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 335 FEB 11, 2009 Baltimore County Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncies			Ins	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,skills for	rom this course	0	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1450/	1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.64
_	_	ctor make clear the		0	0	1	3	6	4	8		1395/		3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.68
		lestions reflect the		0	0	3	3	4	3	9		1192/		3.45	3.57		4.22	3.55
		ations reflect the e		0	5	0	2	1	6	8	4.18			4.25	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.18
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	1	4	2	5	1	1	8	3.47	1269/	1533	3.41	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.47
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	1	6	1	3	0	2	9	4.00	883/1	1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00
		g system clearly exp		1	0	1	4	5	5	6	3.52	1379/	1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.52
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1	1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	9	4	4	3.47	1363/	1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.50
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures well	l prepared	10	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1373/	1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.98
		ctor seem interested		8	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1435/	1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.09
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	8	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1316/	1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.61
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	9	1	1	3	1	1	6	3.67	1322/	1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.56
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enhance	your understanding	8	8	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1323/	1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.65
		Discussion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/	1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
		nts actively encourage	_	19	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/		****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
		ctor encourage fair a		19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/	1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
		Laboratory																
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understanding	of the material	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	71 /	221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.47
		ded with adequate bac		4	0	1	1	2	3		4.22	135/		4.32	4.03	4.12		4.22
		materials available		4	1	0	0	1	2		4.76	/	212	4.80		4.40		4.76
		structor provide assi		4	1	2	3	1	3	8	3.71	175/			4.25	4.35		
		nts for lab reports		4	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	359/		4.03	4.09	4.29		4.24
		Seminar																
1. Were as	ssigned t	copics relevant to the	ne announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
		Field Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribute to	what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
		understand your eva		20	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/	48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
_	-	ctor available for co		20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what	t degree	could you discuss yo	our evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
		Self Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribute to	what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
			Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	ut.io	n										
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	; 				Тур	oe 			Majors 	S 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Grad	duate	е	0	Maj	or	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	В 5				_				_				_			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 7		Gei	nera	11				0	Unde	er-g	rad 2	22	Non	-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0									** ** **			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	jh
			P 0		O	h =				-	0	res	ponse	es to b	e sigr	nifica	nt	
			I 0		Utl	her				Т	.9							

? 2

ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY

Title Instructor: MANNING, STEVEN (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 336 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a 1														
General	0	0	1	4	4	_	-	2 (1	1450/1640	2 02	2 06	4 00	4 07	2 (1
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4 6	6	7		1450/1649	3.93	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	-	1	3	6 4	4	8		1395/1648	3.71	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3		-	3	9		1192/1375	3.45	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5 4	0 2	2 5	1 1	6	8	4.18	916/1595		3.74	4.20	4.21	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	_		3	_	1	8		1269/1533		3.69	4.04	4.05	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	-	0	2	9	4.00	883/1512	4.05	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	5	6		1379/1623	3.65	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	8	3	6	3.63	1281/1621	3.71	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1420/1568	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1512/1572	4.29	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1356/1564	3.89	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	4	1	2	5	3.67	1322/1559	3.70	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1323/1352	3.07	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1382	***	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
T -1														
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	71/ 221	4.43	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	1	2	3	11	4.47	135/ 243	4.43	4.14	4.10	3.89	4.47
1 1 2	4	1				-	14		,					
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	_	0 2	0	1	2	8	4.76	62/ 212		4.30	4.40	4.21	4.76
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1 1	0	3 1	3	3	-	3.71	175/ 209	4.21	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	Τ	U	Т	3	4	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.03	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	***	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	***	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
- ·														
Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	tribu	ution	า									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				2	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 301 0101 University of Maryland Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I

Discussion

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY Enrollment: 82

Ouestionnaires: 47

Page 337 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA		equei 2			5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
Questions	NK	INA						Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	16	24	4.28	943/1649	4.28	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	18	24	4.30	850/1648	4.30	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	13	28	4.40	665/1375	4.40	3.57	4.27	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	24	1	0	5	4	13	4.22	865/1595	4.22	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.22

5.	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	6	3	11	9	14	3.51	1242/1533	3.51	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.51
6.	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	465/1512	4.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.45
7.	. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	9	32	4.53	469/1623	4.53	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.53
8.	. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	1	43	4.93	465/1646	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93
9	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	Λ	Λ	2	3	1.8	15	4 21	731/1621	4 21	3 64	4 06	4 02	4 21

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	37	4.76	480/1568	4.76	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	37	4.82	790/1572	4.82	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	19	2.2	4.33	854/1564	4.33	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.33

3. 7	Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	19	22	4.33	854/1564	4.33	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.33
4. I	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	11	28	4.51	684/1559	4.51	3.79	4.29	4.23	4.51
5. I	oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	27	5	1	2	5	5	3.22	1170/1352	3.22	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.22

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83 ****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40 ****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80 ****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	42	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****

Laboratory													
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67 ****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.22	***

Seminar													
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50 ****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****

Field Work													
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expect	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	1	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	С	9	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	31
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	19	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	38	-			
				2	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland ADVANCED LAB I

Title Baltimore County Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 338

FEB 11, 2009

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	cies 3	s 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	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	898/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	4.36	756/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	853/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	935/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	366/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	4	9	3.91	1180/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	332/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	914/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	461/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5		4.76	912/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9		4.57	580/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	4	8		1221/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	779/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	965/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	851/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3		4.25	844/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	2	7	9	3.95	143/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.95
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	88/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	156/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	95/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35		4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	***	3.82	3.99	4.05	***

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 ADVANCED LAB I

Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 338

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				2	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 Title ADVANCED LAB I

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 339

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 11 9 4.32 898/1649 4.23 3.96 4.28 4.27 4.32 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 12 9 4.36 756/1648 4.25 3.88 4.23 4.18 4.36 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 19 0 0 0 3 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1375 \*\*\*\* 3.57 4.27 4.22 \*\*\*\* 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 6 11 4.23 853/1595 4.19 3.74 4.20 4.21 4.23 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 01 6 5 6 3.89 935/1533 3.73 3.69 4.04 4.05 3.89 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 01 2 2 14 4.53 366/1512 4.37 3.72 4.10 4.11 4.53 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 7 4 9 3.91 1180/1623 3.74 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.91 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 21 4.95 332/1646 4.98 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.95 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 4 6 4 4.00 914/1621 3.70 3.64 4.06 4.02 3.93 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 17 0 0 1 0 0 4 4.40 \*\*\*\*/1568 4.73 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 15 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 1435/1572 4.09 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.40 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 \*\*\*\*/1564 4.32 3.90 4.28 4.25 4.57 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 17 1 1 0 1 0 2 3.50 \*\*\*\*/1559 3.89 3.79 4.29 4.23 3.85 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 18 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1352 3.89 3.60 3.98 3.97 3.94 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 2 4 3.75 965/1384 3.68 3.52 4.08 4.11 3.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 1 6 4.22 851/1382 3.91 3.84 4.29 4.37 4.22 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 844/1368 3.93 3.63 4.30 4.39 4.25 4. Were special techniques successful 14 4 0 2 1 1 3.75 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 2 2 7 9 3.95 143/221 3.98 4.14 4.16 4.07 3.95 2. Were you provided with adequate background information  $\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 \\ \end{array}$ 1 0 9 11 4.43 88/ 243 4.14 4.03 4.12 3.89 4.43 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 4 6 9 4.00 156/ 212 3.65 4.30 4.40 4.21 4.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 0 2 1 17 4.57 95/209 4.29 4.25 4.35 4.12 4.57 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 4 8 9 4.24 359/555 4.08 4.09 4.29 4.22 4.24 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20 1 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.54 4.63 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 1 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.55 \*\*\*\* 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.35 4.46 \*\*\*\* 20 1 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.83 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* 3.25 4.06 3.59 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* 3.02 4.09 4.21 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.43 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 39 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.38 4.32 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 4.38 3.68 3.60 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 3.70 4.30 4.32 \*\*\*\* 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* 3.72 4.16 4.44 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 0 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
 Were there enough proctors for all the students 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* 4.04 4.43 5.00 \*\*\*\* 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 24 \*\*\*\* 4.18 4.42 5.00 \*\*\*\*

21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 110 \*\*\*\* 3.82 3.99 4.05 \*\*\*\*

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 ADVANCED LAB I

Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

Fall 2008

Page 339

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 Title

ADVANCED LAB I

Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 340 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Exc	equer	nai o	a		Tnat	ructor	Courac	Dont	TIMDC	Torrol	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	UMBC : Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	898/1649	4.23		4.28	4.27	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	4.36	756/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3		****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6		4.23	853/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	935/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2		4.53	366/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	4			1180/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	332/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1030/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1390/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1559	3.89	3.79			3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	965/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1		4.22	851/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3		4.25	844/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1			****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95		****
1. NOTO SPOSIAI COSIMIQUES SUCCESSIUI		•	Ü	Ü	-	_	_	3.73	, 510		3.30	3.75	1.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	2	7	9	3.95	143/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.95
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	88/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	156/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	95/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.02	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0			****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced			_			_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	***

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland Page 340 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 ADVANCED LAB I Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland Title

ADVANCED LAB I Baltimore County Instructor: ZHANG, YU (Instr. D) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 341

FEB 11, 2009

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	898/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	9	4.36	756/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.27	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3		****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	853/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	935/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	366/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10		4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	4	9		1180/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21		332/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69		4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	4	4			1151/1621					3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70		4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28		4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	0	1		****/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	965/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1		4.22	851/1382	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	844/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1			****/ 948	****	3.50		4.00	****
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	1	2	7	9		143/ 221	3.98	4.14		4.07	3.95
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	88/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	4	6	9		156/ 212	3.65	4.30	4.40		4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	95/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	359/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.24
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 ADVANCED LAB I

Instructor: ZHANG, YU (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 341

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				2	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201 University of Maryland Page 342 FEB 11, 2009

Title ADVANCED LAB I Baltimore County Instructor: MANG, STEPHEN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	1 11	1076/164	1 1 12	2 06	4 00	4 07	1 11
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2 4	8 4	4		1076/1649		3.96	4.28	4.27 4.18	4.14 4.14
<ul><li>2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li><li>3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li></ul>	0	11	0	0	0	2	6 1		1021/1648 ****/137!		3.88	4.23	4.18	4.14 ****
-	0	11	0	0	3	6	5	4.33			3.57	4.27	4.22	4.14
<ul><li>4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</li><li>5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned</li></ul>	0	0	1	3	2	3	5		956/159! 1200/153:		3.74	4.20	4.05	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21				4.10	4.11	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	a 0	0	0	2	4	<i>5</i>	2		1359/1623			4.16	4.11	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.16	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes		0	0	0	3	6	1		1151/162			4.09	4.07	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	588/1568	3 4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	912/1572	2 4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1096/156	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1181/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	860/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.83
Discussion	•	0	0	0	2	1	-	2 62	1020/102		2 52	4 00	4 7 7	2 60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	1		1039/1384		3.52	4.08	4.11	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	0	2		1175/138:		3.84	4.29	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	3	1	1		1143/1368			4.30	4.39	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	3 ****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	129/ 22	1 3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	179/ 243		4.03	4.12	3.89	3.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	3	4	5	1				4.30	4.40	4.21	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	151/ 209		4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92			4.09	4.29		3.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88		4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 8!		5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 83		5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	3 ****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3 00	****/ 52	2 ****	3.25	4.06	2 50	****
						U	U	3.00	/ 5.	2	3.23	1.00	3.35	
Fre	quency	7 Dis	strib	outio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s 			Re	asons				T <u>y</u>	ype 			Majors	; 
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	ce	0	Majo	or	9
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 2		Ge	enera	al				0	Under-	grad :	14	Non-	-major	5
84-150 7 3.00-3.49 3 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 1		El	.ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means	there a	are not	enoug	rh
Р 0									respons	ses to l	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
I 0		Ot	her				1	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201 University of Maryland Page 343 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title Baltimore County ADVANCED LAB I Instructor: GINEVAN, BRANDO (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mear
 General														
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1076/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.14
. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1021/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.14
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	956/1595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.14
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1200/1533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.57
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 £	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	735/1512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.21
. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	2	3.57	1359/1623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.57
. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 7	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.46
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.69
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.79
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.08
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.92
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1039/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.60
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	0			1175/1382		3.84	4.29	4.37	3.60
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1143/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.60
. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	129/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00
. Were you provided with adequate background information	n 1	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	179/ 243	4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.85
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	3	4	5		3.31			4.30	4.40		3.31
. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	151/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00
. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	420/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92
Seminar														
. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	***	4.33	4.54	4.63	***
. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	***
. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	***
. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
Fred	quency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	3			Re:	asons	<b>!</b>			Ту	ne			Majors	3
	-													
00-27		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	9
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 2		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	-major	5
84-150 7 3.00-3.49 3 D 1 Grad 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 1		E14	ecti	7es				1	#### -	Means +	here =	ire not	enous	יh
84-150 7 3.00-3.49 3 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 1 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - respons					gh

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201 University of Maryland Title FEB 11, 2009

ADVANCED LAB I Baltimore County Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. C) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 344

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rar	_	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General	 1																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1076/1	L649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1021/1	L648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1	L375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	3	6	5	4.14	956/1	L595	4.19	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned							1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1200/1	L533	3.73	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned							0	0	4	3	7	4.21	735/1	L512	4.37	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained							0	2	4	6	2	3.57	1359/1	L623	3.74	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1	L646	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					5	1	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1451/1	L621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.46
		Lecture			11														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1	L568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	3	1	1		1529/1		4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	1	2	0	0		****/1		4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1	L559	3.89	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/]	L352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.83
1 5'	2.1	Discuss			9	0	_	•	2		_	2 55	1000:		2	2	4 00	4	2 52
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	0	3	1	1		1039/1		3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.60
					9 9	0	0	1	2	0	2		1175/1		3.91	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	3	1	1		1143/1		3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.60
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sstul		9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
1 Did +b	o lob ind	Laborat crease understar	-	f the meterial	1	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	129/	221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00
					1	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	179/		4.14	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information						0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	206/		3.65	4.30	4.12	4.21	3.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities						1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00			4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					1 1	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	420/		4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	
		Semina	r																
1 Were a	ssianed t			announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/	88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention						0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear					13 13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
		Field W	Work																
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned				12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/	52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons						Ту			pe		Majors		<b>;</b>
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5			 mir	 ed f	or Ma	 ior		1		duat		 0	 Majo		9
28-55	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3					1/6/	2011	cu I	or ma	דטע	2	_	Grac	aud L t	-	5	ra J		,
56-83							General					0	Under-grad 14			4	Non-major		5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 1		General						-	01100	onaci graa 11			INOIT-IIIA JUL		-
Grad.	Ó					Electives						1	####	#### - Means there ar				re not enough	
	-		-	P 0											es to b			_	•
		I 0					Other					1							
2 0						OCHEL						±±							

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201 University of Maryland Page 345 Title FEB 11, 2009 ADVANCED LAB I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: ZHANG, YU (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Overtien -		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4					_		tructor		Dept			Sect				
		Question	.s 		NR	NA . – – –	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	1																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1076/1649	4.23	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1021/1648	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	****	3.57	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	3	6	5		956/1595		3.74	4.20	4.21	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned							1	3	2	3	5		1200/1533		3.69	4.04	4.05	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned							0	0	4	3	7		735/1512		3.72	4.10	4.11	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained							0	2	4	6	2		1359/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. HOW WO	oura you	grade the overa	II tead	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1440/1621	3.70	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.46	
		Lectur	е																
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1568	4.73	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1556/1572	4.09	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1564	4.32	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	1	0	0		****/1559		3.79	4.29	4.23	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	3.89	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.83	
		Discus	sion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1039/1384	3.68	3.52	4.08	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	1	2	0	2		1175/1382		3.84	4.29	4.37	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1143/1368	3.93	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful					9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****	
		Labora	tory																
1. Did th	Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material					0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	129/ 221	3.98	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00	
	2. Were you provided with adequate background information						0	0	5	5	3	3.85			4.03	4.12	3.89	3.85	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities						0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	206/ 212		4.30	4.40	4.21	3.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance						1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	151/ 209	4.29	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					1	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	420/ 555	4.08	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92	
		Semina	25																
1 Were a	agianed :			announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention						0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85		5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81		5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		4.50	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear					13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****	
1 Did fi	ald arma	Field		that row laammad	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	2 00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****	
I. DIG II	.ета ехре.	rience contribu	le lo w	hat you learned	12	U	U	U	2	U	U	3.00	****/ 52		3.45	4.06	3.59		
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Ty	Туре			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Required for Majo					s	1	Graduate		0	Major		9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 1	B 3 C 2		G 1						0	IIn dans	The deep energy 1.4			37		
56-83 84-150	1 7	2.00-2.99	3	C 2 D 1		General						0	Under-grad 14 Non-major				-ma Jor	5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00						Electives					#### -	#### - Means there are not enough					
Graa.	J	3.30 1.00	5	P 0								1		responses to be significant					
	I O					Other						.1	responded to be brightricalle						
2 0						Octiet						±±							

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 288 Ouestionnaires: 195

SMITH, PAUL J.

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 346

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

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 3 0 4 2 22 53 111 4.38 803/1649 4.15 3.96 4.28 4.27 4.38 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 11 22 65 94 4.26 885/1648 3.89 3.88 4.23 4.18 4.26 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 0 2 6 24 65 94 4.27 788/1375 3.90 3.57 4.27 4.22 4.27 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 72 7 7 18 33 54 4.01 1067/1595 3.85 3.74 4.20 4.21 4.01 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 10 2 6 24 47 102 4.33 545/1533 4.32 3.69 4.04 4.05 4.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 111 8 4 19 20 27 3.69 1154/1512 3.74 3.72 4.10 4.11 3.69 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 1 2 3 24 54 106 4.37 671/1623 4.19 3.84 4.16 4.08 4.37 8. How many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 1 1 152 35 4.17 1462/1646 4.55 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 40 2 2 1 12 68 70 4.33 607/1621 3.88 3.64 4.06 4.02 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 1 1 6 38 145 4.70 573/1568 4.37 4.13 4.43 4.39 4.70 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 1 0 3 16 171 4.86 690/1572 4.87 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 1 6 26 63 94 4.28 918/1564 3.76 3.90 4.28 4.25 4.28 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 5 5 17 44 119 4.41 832/1559 3.90 3.79 4.29 4.23 4.41 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 98 16 8 24 16 19 3.17 1189/1352 3.46 3.60 3.98 3.97 3.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 159 0 6 2 7 11 10 3.47 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 3.52 4.08 4.11 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 158 0 5 3 11 7 11 3.43 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 3.84 4.29 4.37 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 159 1 9 6 18 4.03 \*\*\*\*/1368 \*\*\*\* 3.63 4.30 4.39 \*\*\*\* 0 2 4. Were special techniques successful 157 25 2 4 0 7 3.92 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 3 4.20 \*\*\*\*/ 221 \*\*\*\* 4.14 4.16 4.07 \*\*\*\* 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 186 0 2 4 4.29 \*\*\*\* / 243 \*\*\*\* 4.03 4.12 3.89 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 188 0 Ω 1 0 0 1 4 4.80 \*\*\*\*/ 212 \*\*\*\* 4.30 4.40 4.21 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 188 2 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 1 0 2 2 4.00 \*\*\*\* / 209 \*\*\*\* 4.25 4.35 4.12 \*\*\*\* 188 2 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 179 2 1 2 2 1 8 3.93 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.09 4.29 4.22 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 192 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.54 4.63 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 191 0 0 1 0 0 3 4.25 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.55 \*\*\*\* 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.43 4.30 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 191 2 0 0 2 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 189 1 1 3 0 3.40 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.83 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 191 0 1 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* 3.25 4.06 3.59 \*\*\*\* 0 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 191 0 3 0 1 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* 3.02 4.09 4.21 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 191 0 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.43 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 191 2 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.38 4.32 \*\*\*\* 4 0 5 2 3.45 \*\*\*\* / 312 \*\*\*\* 4.38 3.68 3.60 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 184 0 0 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 3.20 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 3.70 4.30 4.32 \*\*\*\* 190 1 3.60 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* 3.72 4.16 4.44 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 190 1 1 2 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 190 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* 4.04 4.43 5.00 \*\*\*\* 1 2 1 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 191 0 0 1 2 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 24 \*\*\*\* 4.18 4.42 5.00 \*\*\*\* 190 0 1 1 0 2 1 3.20 \*\*\*\*/ 110 \*\*\*\* 3.82 3.99 4.05 \*\*\*\* 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.

Enrollment: 288
Questionnaires: 195

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 346 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	43	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	53	1.00-1.99	0	В	65						
56-83	30	2.00-2.99	25	C	47	General	1	Under-grad	194	Non-major	185
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	35	D	5						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	48	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	172	-		_	
				?	13						

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: PERKS, MARK

Enrollment: 187
Questionnaires: 123

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 347 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	5	10	24	29	50	3.92	1254/1649	4.15	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	5	18	34	35	27	3.51	1477/1648	3.89	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	8	14	37	28	32	3.52	1200/1375	3.90	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	44	5	6	18	23	22	3.69	1323/1595	3.85	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	16	4	2	14	20	60		,	4.32	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	60	4	3	11	18	18		1095/1512	3.74	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	3	11	20		52		1029/1623	4.19	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.01
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	0		106	4.93		4.55	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	8	6	31	41	12	3.44	1387/1621	3.88	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	10	16	40	46		1265/1568	4.37	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3		102	4.88	640/1572	4.87	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	13	16	35	27	21		1462/1564	3.76	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	18	10	23	28	31		1408/1559	3.90	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	13	11	3	21	22	37	3.76	914/1352	3.46	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	99	0	5	1	5	8	5		****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	100	0	1	3	3	6	10		****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	101	0	3	2	8	4	5		****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	101	1	2	1	3	6	9	3.90	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	120	1	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	2	1	0	0		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 212	****	4.30	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	120	1	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	115	1	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	122	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	122	0	1	0	0	0	0		,	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	122 122	0	1 1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92 ****/ 288	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	122	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	****/ 288		3.83	3.68	3.58	* * * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	121	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	122	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	122	0	1	0	0	0	0		,	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	122 120	0	1 1	0 1	0	1	0		****/ 39 ****/ 312	****	5.00 4.38	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	120	U	1	1	U	1	U	2.33	****/ 312		4.38	3.08	3.60	* * * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	122	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	122	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	120	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	^ ^ * *

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: PERKS, MARK

Enrollment: 187
Questionnaires: 123

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 347 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	10
28-55	29	1.00-1.99	3	В	43						
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	9	C	32	General	2	Under-grad	121	Non-major	113
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	19	D	5						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	38	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	<sub>j</sub> h
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	98	_			
				?	8						

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

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 348

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Mas the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 1 7 2 2 3 .07 1526/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 531/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 Elow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 11 0 0 2.79 1557/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 Elow many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.79 1557/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 Elow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 11 0 0 2.79 1557/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 Elow many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 6 6 1 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 6 6 1 0 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 6 6 7 0 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 10 3 0 0 2.14 1556/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 3 3 6 2 0 0 1.91 1554/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 Did tall students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11 Eloratory Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1388 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 Eloratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.38 215/ 243 3.82 4.03 4.29 4.37 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 1 3 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/ 243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 Were encessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 3 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/ 243 3.82 4.03 4.24 3.89 Were encessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 180/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.35 4.02 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 180/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.35 4.02 4.03 4.04 4.21 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 180/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.36 4.29 4.22 8.25 4.35 4.35 4.35 4.35 4.35 4.35 4.35 4.3								Fr	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea:
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course																			
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 4 7 1 1 1 2.79 1614/1648 3.70 3.88 4.23 4.18 did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 2 2 7 2 0 2.69 1365/1375 3.24 3.57 4.27 4.22 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 1 5 2 2 2 2 2.92 1552/1595 3.51 3.74 4.20 4.21 did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 7 3 1 3.23 1377/1533 3.65 3.69 4.04 4.05 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 2 3 4 1 2 2.83 1470/1512 3.45 3.72 4.10 4.11 Mas the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 2 1 7 2 2 3.07 1356/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.92 531/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 11 0 0 0 2.79 1557/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 Lecture  Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 6 6 7 0 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 0 3 0 0 1.1 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 0 3 0 0 1.1 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 0 3 0 0 1.1 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 0 3 0 0 1.0 1.0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 0 1 0 3 0 0 1.0 1.0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 0 1 0 3 0 0 0 0 1.0 1.0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0										_	_								
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 2 2 7 7 2 0 2.69 1358/1375 3.24 3.57 4.20 4.21 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 1 5 5 2 2 2.92 1552/1595 3.51 3.74 4.20 4.21 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 7 3 1 1 3.23 1373/1533 3.65 3.69 4.04 4.05 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 2 3 4 4 1 2 2.83 1470/1512 3.45 3.72 4.10 4.11 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 1 7 7 2 2 3.07 1526/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.05 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.755/1621 3.45 3.72 4.05 4.06 4.05 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 0 0 0 3 11 0 0 2.79 1557/1621 3.63 4.23 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 How would you grade the overall prepared 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.05 4.05 4.06 4.05 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 0 0 0 1 6 6 0 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.04 4.05 4.05 How would you grade the overall prepared 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.04 4.05 4.05 How would you grade the overall prepared 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1																			3.4
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals				_	_						_								2.7
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 7 3 1 1 3.23 1373/1533 3.65 3.69 4.04 4.05 bid written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 2 3 4 7 3 1 2 2.83 1470/1512 3.45 2.72 4.10 4.11 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 1 7 7 2 2 3 3.07 1526/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.92 531/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 1 0 0 2.79 1557/1624 3.56 4.85 4.86 4.06 4.02 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 1 0 0 2.79 1557/1624 3.56 4.36 4.06 4.02 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 How would you grade the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 How would prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_	-									-							2.6
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned Nas the grading system clearly explained 0 2 2 3 3 4 1 2 2 8.83 1470/1512 3.45 3.72 4.10 4.11 Mas the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 2 1 7 2 2 3.07 1526/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 531/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 11 0 0 2.79 1557/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 6 6 1 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 6 7 0 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 10 3 0 0 2.19 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 6 7 0 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 10 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 10 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 Did daddivisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 ****/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1382 3.84 3.84 4.29 4.37 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1388 3.49 3.69 4.39 4.39 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 1 2 4 5 3.88 16/0 212 4.07 4.30 4.00 4.12 3.89 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 3 2 5 3.85 164 221 3.92 4.14 4.06 4.07 4.20 Did the lab instructor provide assistance				_	_														2.9
Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 1 7 2 2 3.07 1526/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 531/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 11 0 0 0 2.79 1557/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02   **Lecture**  **Le		_	-		_							1						4.05	3.2
How many times was class cancelled						0						2	2.83	1470/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.8
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0					ned	-	-	_	_	7		2	3.07	1526/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.0
Lecture   Were the instructor's lectures well prepared   0 0 0 1 6 6 1 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0 0 6 7 0 1 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   0 0 1 10 3 0 0 2.14 1556/1564 3.55 3.99 4.29 4.25 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   0 3 3 3 6 2 0 0 1.91 1554/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding   0 10 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97      Discussion								-	-	-		12	4.92	531/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.9
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 6 6 1 0 2.50 1555/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 6 7 0 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 0 3 0 0 2.14 1556/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 3 3 3 6 2 0 0 1.91 1554/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 May 10 10 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	How woul	ıld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	2.79	1557/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.8
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 6 7 0 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 10 3 0 0 2.14 1556/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 3 3 6 2 0 0 1.91 1554/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97    Discussion			Lectur	е															
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 6 7 0 1 0 1.71 1572/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 10 3 0 0 2.14 1556/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 3 3 6 2 0 0 1.91 1554/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97    Discussion	Were the	ne instr			repared	0	0	1	6	6	1	0	2.50	1555/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	2.7
Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 10 3 0 0 2.14 1556/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 3 6 2 0 0 1.91 1554/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 ****/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1382 3.84 3.84 4.29 4.37 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1388 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 1 3 3 2 6 6 3.85 164/221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 4 5 3.85 180/212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were exceptions relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63 Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63 ***  Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60 ***  Frequency Distribution  Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 A 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				_	-		-	_			_	0							2.7
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					_		-	_		-	_	0							2.7
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 1 0 1 2 0 3.00 1219/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97    Discussion			_			-					-	-		,					2.4
Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11  Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1382 3.84 3.84 4.29 4.37  Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1388 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39  Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 1 3 2 6 3.85 164/221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07  Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89  Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 4 5 3.85 180/212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21  Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12  Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63  Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 6											-								
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1382 3.84 3.84 4.29 4.37 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 1 3 2 6 3.85 164/221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 2 4 5 3.85 180/212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63 Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60 Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Of Graduate Decision Majors Distribution Decision Deci	Dia addi	11011544	ir ceeminques en	nance yo	ar anacrocanaring	O	10	_	O	_	2	Ü	3.00	1217/1332	3.00	3.00	3.70	3.77	5.0
Mere all students actively encouraged to participate   13   0   0   1   0   0   0   2.00   ****/1382   3.84   3.84   4.29   4.37																			
Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 1 3 2 6 3.85 164/ 221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/ 243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 4 5 3.85 180/ 212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/ 209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 3.89 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/ 555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63  Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  Edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					_							_							***
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 1 3 2 6 3.85 164/ 221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/ 243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 4 5 3.85 180/ 212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/ 209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/ 555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22  Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63  Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6																			***
Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 1 1 3 2 6 3.85 164/221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 4 5 3.85 180/212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63  Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 6	Did the	instru	uctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	***
Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 2 3 1 2 5 3.38 215/ 243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 4 5 3.85 180/ 212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/ 209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/ 555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63  Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Majors  8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6			Labora	tory															
Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 4 5 3.85 180/ 212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/ 209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/ 555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22    Seminar   Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63     Field Work   Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60     Frequency Distribution   Frequency Distri	Did the	e lab in	ncrease understa	nding of	the material	1	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	164/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.8
Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 1 1 2 4 5 3.85 180/ 212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/ 209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/ 555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22    Seminar   Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63     Field Work   Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60     Frequency Distribution   Frequency Distri	Were voi	ou provi	ded with adequa	te backq	round information	1	0	2	3	1	2	5	3.38	215/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.3
Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 190/ 209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 1 3 1 3 5 3.62 463/ 555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22    Seminar   Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63						1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	180/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.8
Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified       1       0       1       3       1       3       5       3.62       463/555       3.90       4.09       4.29       4.22         Seminar         Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme       13       0       0       0       1       0       4.00       ****/ 88       ****       4.33       4.54       4.63         Field Work         Did conferences help you carry out field activities       13       0       0       0       0       1       0       4.00       *****/ 312       ****       4.38       3.68       3.60         Frequency Distribution         edits Earned       Cum. GPA       Expected Grades       Reasons       Type       Majors         0-27       1       0.00-0.99       0       A       2       Required for Majors       0       Graduate       0       Majors         8-55       2       1.00-1.99       0       B       6       Required for Majors       0       Graduate       0       Majors							0												
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63  Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6			-															4.22	3.6
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.33 4.54 4.63  Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6																			
Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6	Were ass	ssigned		_	announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	***
Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.38 3.68 3.60  Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6																			
Frequency Distribution  edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6	Did conf	nference			eld activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	***
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6				2							_			,					
0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6					Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6	dits Ear	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
8-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6	)-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	 guir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Maio	 or	
				-									-		-	-	) (		•
the constant of the second of				-			Ger	nera	1				1	Under-a	rad 1	4	Non-	-maior	14
4-150 3 3.00-3.49 6 D 0							001	c_u	_				-	011401 9		-	2,011		_
rad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough		-		-	- •		<b>ភ</b> ា 4	2C+ i	vec.				0	#### - 1	Meang t	here =	re not	enous	rh
P 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough	uu.	U	3.30-4.00	J			E16	LULI	v CD				J					_	111
I 0 Other 10					- · ·		O+1	hor				1	0	respons	ca LU I	e sigi	ıııcdı	10	
otner 10							OCI	ier.				1	. U						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: XIE, MIN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 349 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructo: Ran	_	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 1																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski		n this course	1	0	0	1	7	3	2	3.46	1508/1	1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.46
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	4	7	1	1	2.79	1614/1	1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	2.79
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	2	2	7	2	0	2.69	1358/1	1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.69
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	2	1	5	2	2	2	2.92	1552/1	1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	2.92
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	1	0	2	7	3	1	3.23	1373/1	1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.23
6. Did wr:	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	2	2	3	4	1	2	2.83	1470/1	1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.83
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ined	0	0	2	1	7	2	2	3.07	1526/1	1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.07
		was class cance			0	1	0	0	0	1			531/1		4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	3	9	2	0	2.93	1528/1	1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.86
		Lecture	9																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	0	0	2	1	7	4	0	2.93	1532/1	1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	2.71
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1504/1	1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	2.78
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	6	0	3.31	1448/1	1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	2.73
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what y	you learned	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	3.00	1479/1	1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.45
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	0	12	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/	1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
				d to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
				d open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
		Laborat	orv																
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understar	_	the material	1	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	164/	221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.85
				ground information	1	0	2	3	1	2	5	3.38	215/		3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.38
				or lab activities	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	180/		4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.85
		tructor provide			1	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	190/		3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.46
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	1	0	1	3	1	3	5	3.62	463/	555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.62
		Semina	r																
1. Were as	ssigned t			announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
		Field V	Nork																
5. Did con	nferences			ield activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
				_	-														
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6				_							_				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera	.1				1	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	4	Non-	-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0								_							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	h
				P 0		<u> </u>	l= -				-	0	resp	ponse	es to b	e sign	ufican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	U							
				? 1															

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 350

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	644/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	862/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1 2	0	1 1	5 2	3 5	4 4		1107/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.77 4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5 4	7	4.00	1067/1595 663/1533	3.51 3.65	3.74 3.69	4.20	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	5	4		1008/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	7		861/1623	3.52	3.72	4.16	4.11	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	9	2	0		1528/1621			4.06	4.02	3.86
. 3		-	-	-	-	_								
Lecture	0	0	0	6	2	4	1	2 00	1515/1560	2 57	1 12	1 12	4 20	2 06
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>	0	0	0	3	3 7	4 1	1		1515/1568 1549/1572	3.57 3.63	4.13	4.43 4.70	4.39 4.64	3.86 4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3 4	8	1	_		1515/1564	3.50	3.90	4.70	4.25	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	9	0	1		1520/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	1	1	_		1002/1352				3.97	
5. 21d ddd20/12dd1 cccimi14dc2 cimiaicc 7od1 didd22cdid2iig	_	Ü	_	Ü	_	_	_	5.00	1002,1302	3.00	3.00	3.70	3.7.	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	708/1384		3.52	4.08	4.11	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	2		1071/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	107/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	142/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	74/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	81/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	428/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	***	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12 11	1 1	0 1	1	0	0 1	0		****/ 92 ****/ 288	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	Τ	1	U	U	1	0	2.50	^^^^/ 288	^^^	3.83	3.68	3.58	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 350 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	_		_	
				?	1						

University of Maryland
AB Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

16

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 351 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

2				~										
Over while were	NTD	377		_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR 	NA 	1	2 	3 	4 	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	644/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	862/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1107/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	663/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	5			1008/1512			4.10	4.11	3.92
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	1	0	1	5		4.21	861/1623	3.52		4.16	4.08	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	146/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	554/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	216/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	11	4.43	804/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	690/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	708/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	_		1071/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
i. Wele special techniques successful		5	_	U	_	Ü	O	2.00	, 510		3.30	3.75	1.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	107/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	142/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	74/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	81/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	428/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3 00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50		****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.02	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
		-	_	-	-	-	_		,					
Self Paced		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	***	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0			****	4.18	4.42	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 351 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	_		_	
				?	1						

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

Title Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 16

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

Page 352

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1415/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.69
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	1434/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.63
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	2	3	4	2	2	3	2.86	1346/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.86
		ations reflect			0	3	2	3	2	0	6	3.38	1452/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.38
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	505/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.38
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	994/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92
		system clearl		ined	0	0	3	0	7	1	5	3.31	1470/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.31
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	1	6	9	0	0	2.50	1588/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.88
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	4	9	3	0	2.94	1530/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.29
		tor seem inter			0	0	2	4	6	1	3	2.94	1563/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.30
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	4	11	0	1	2.88	1521/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.17
		s contribute t		-	0	0	4	5	6	0			1539/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.62
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	8	3	1	1	1	2	2.75	1277/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.47
		Discus																
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
				d to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
				d open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	***	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	tory															
		rease understa			6	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	118/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.20
_	_	_		ground information	6	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	193/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.70
	_			or lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	148/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.10
		tructor provid			6	0	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	196/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.40
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	5	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Rec	 guire	ed f	 or Ma	ior	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 4			'	_		J						) (		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-	3.		-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoua	h
	-		=	P 0								-	respons				_	
				I 0		Otł	ner					9			3			
							-											

? 0

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

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore Count Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 353

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		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	1	6	1	2 60	1415/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	6	4		1415/1649	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	4	2	2	3		1346/1375	3.70	3.57	4.27	4.22	2.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	3	2	0	6		1452/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2		4.38			3.69	4.04	4.05	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	,		3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	7	1	5		1470/1623		3.84	4.16	4.11	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	10	5	0		1451/1621			4.06	4.02	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	1	10	5	U	3.23	1431/1021	3.10	3.04	4.00	4.02	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1431/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	8	2		1524/1572		4.23	4.70	4.64	3.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	3	5	3		1403/1564		3.90	4.28	4.25	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	4	1		1495/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	1	1	1	0		1330/1352		3.60	3.98	3.97	2.47
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	118/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	193/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	148/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.10
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	196/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 4		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	U	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
20-33 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 4														

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 354

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	8	1	3.18	1578/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	7	1		1575/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	3	5	1	2	3.18	1300/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	5	5	2		1389/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	7	5	1	3.19	1392/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	7	2	2	3.07	1420/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1379/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	4	8	2	0	2.53	1585/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	5	3	7	1		1509/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	3	2	4	4		1555/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	7	5	3		1399/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	5	5	1		1505/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	1	1	0		1366/1384	3.14		4.08	4.11	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	0		****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	2	0	0		****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	210/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	215/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	194/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	180/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	467/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	***	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 354 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-		_	
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: HOUPT, JOSH (Instr. B) Enrollment:

17

Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 355 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 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	2	3	3	8	1	3.18	1578/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	7	1		1575/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	3	5	1	2	3.18	1300/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1389/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	7	5	1	3.19	1392/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	7	2	2	3.07	1420/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1379/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	4	8	3	3.65	1274/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	8	0		1481/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	7	4	3	3.53	1535/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	7	3		1273/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	6	3		1362/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	1	1	0		1366/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	0		****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	2	0	0		****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	210/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	215/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	194/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	180/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	467/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 81	***	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1 1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	U	1	U	U	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.58	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	***	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: HOUPT, JOSH (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Fall 2008

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 355

Enrollment: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad 1	L7	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here a	re not enough	h
				P	0			responses to b	oe sign	ificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_	_		
				?	1						

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 356 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1295/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	6		1124/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	4	3		1150/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1175/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	5	1	3.13	1411/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1320/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	5	6	3.73	1281/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	945/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	8	6	0	0	2.25	1607/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	8	2	4	0		1555/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	7	4	2	1		1569/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	7	7	2	0		1539/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	1	3	0		1542/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/1384			4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	170/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	193/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	148/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.10
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	164/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	461/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	***	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00		****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	***

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 356 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	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						

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: YUANYUAN, LIU (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 357 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1295/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1124/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1150/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1175/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	5	1	3.13	1411/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1320/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	5	6		1281/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0			945/1646	4.95			4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	1141/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	1012/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	1	12		1241/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	3	9		1010/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	8		1121/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	170/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	193/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	148/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.10
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	164/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	461/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	***	4.38	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.44	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: YUANYUAN, LIU (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 16 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 357 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

16

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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 358 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General			_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3 6	6	5		1343/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0 1	1 1	2 5	3	2 1	5 5		1481/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3 6	1			1278/1375 1463/1595	3.24 3.51	3.57 3.74	4.27 4.20	4.22 4.21	3.27 3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	6	4		1065/1533	3.65	3.69	4.20	4.05	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	8	1	4		1287/1512		3.72	4.10	4.11	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	2	4		1446/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	5	7	1	0		1599/1621		3.64	4.06		3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	5	3	3	3.19	1502/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	5	3	3		1553/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	8	3			1496/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	5	2	2		1512/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	129/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	100/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	105/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	84/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	293/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.50
Seminar		•				•					4 00			
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15 15	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 85 ****/ 92	****	5.00 4.50	4.47	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 288	****	3.83	4.35	4.46 3.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 358 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 359 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	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	1	1	3	6	5	3 81	1343/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	2	5		1481/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	1	5		1278/1375		3.57	4.27	4.22	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	6	1	4		1463/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	6	4		1065/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	8	1	4		1287/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	2	4		1446/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	3	0	7	5	3.75	1192/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	1	10	4.29	1096/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1486/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	2	5	5	3.79	1282/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	6		1258/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	129/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	100/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	105/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	84/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	293/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.32	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.05	***

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601 Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 359 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16
Ouestionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 360 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 2 4 9 4.31 898/1649 3.85 3.96 4.28 4.27 4.31 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 2 4 4 5 3.63 1434/1648 3.70 3.88 4.23 4.18 3.63 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 2 3 3 2 3 3.08 1322/1375 3.24 3.57 4.27 4.22 3.08 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 2 3 3 3 5 3.38 1456/1595 3.51 3.74 4.20 4.21 3.38 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 1 2 4 7 3.81 1006/1533 3.65 3.69 4.04 4.05 3.81 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 3 3 2 5 3.33 1345/1512 3.45 3.72 4.10 4.11 3.33 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 5 4 4 3 3.31 1470/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.31 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 816/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 4.81 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 3 8 4 0 2.94 1525/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 3.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 2 4 2 7 3.75 1401/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 3.34 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 2 4 3 7 3.94 1483/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 3.56 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 5 5 3 3.50 1388/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 3.31 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 4 2 2 7 3.63 1336/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 3.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 0 2 1 2 1 3.33 1130/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 3.29 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 3.84 3.84 4.29 4.37 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 04. Were special techniques successful 14 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 1 1 3 2 6 3.85 164/221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 3.852. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 4 4 3.77 187/243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 3.77 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 135/ 212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 4.234. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 1 2 1 3 1 5 3.50 186/ 209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 3.50 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 1 1 3 1 7 3.92 420/555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22 3.92 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.83 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 312 \*\*\*\* 4.38 3.68 3.60 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Majors Reasons \_\_\_\_\_\_ 00-27 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major в 7 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 56-83 2 General 0 Under-grad 16 Non-major 15 84-150 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Ω F 0 Electives 0 Grad. 3.50-4.00 4 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 14

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

Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Page 361 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

<	tudent	Course	Fvaluation	Ouestionnain	re
ಾ	Ludelil	Course	Evaluation	Ouest Tomma I	$L \subset$

							Fre	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 541		General	=	4.1- J	^	0	0	1	_	4	0	4 21	000/1640	2 05	2 06	4 00	4 07	4 21
		v insights,skii			0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	,		3.96	4.28	4.27	4.31
		or make clear	_	_	0	0	1	2	4	4			1434/1648		3.88	4.23	4.18	3.63
		estions reflect			0	3	2	3	3	2			1322/1375		3.57	4.27		3.08
		ations reflect	_	_	0	0	2	3	3	3			1456/1595		3.74			
				hat you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4			1006/1533		3.69			3.81
				what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	2			1345/1512			4.10	4.11	
		system clearly	-	ned	0	0	0	5	4				1470/1623			4.16		3.31
		vas class cance			0	0	0	0	1				816/1646				4.67	
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overal	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	0	0	2	1	9	2	2	3.06	1494/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.00
		Lecture	<u>.</u>															
1 Were t	he instruc	ctor's lectures		repared	1	0	4	1	4	4	2	2 93	1530/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.34
		or seem inter			0	0	2	0	8	5			1553/1572		4.23		4.64	
				plained clearly	0	0	1	4	5	4			1485/1564		3.90	4.28	4.25	
		s contribute to			2	0	3	3	4	3			1520/1559		3.79	4.29	4.23	
				ur understanding	0		1	0	1	1			1160/1352				3.97	
5. Did au	laiovisuai	techniques em	lance you	ur understanding	U	12	1	U	Τ	1	Τ	3.45	1100/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
				to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did th	e instruct	or encourage i	fair and	open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
		chniques succes		-	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
		_ ,																
		Laborat	-		_				_	_	_						4 0=	
		rease understar			3	0	1	1	3	2			. ,			4.16	4.07	3.85
				round information	3	0	1	0	4	4			187/ 243		4.03		3.89	3.77
				r lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	6					4.30			4.23
		tructor provide			3	1	2	1	3	1		3.50	,		4.25	4.35	4.12	
5. Were r	requirement	s for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	3	0	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	420/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.92
		Semina	_															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	=		14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	***
F D:3		Field V		-14	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 312	++++	4 20	2 (0	2 (0	++++
5. Dia co	mierences	neip you carry	/ Out II	eld activities	15	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	^^^/ 312		4.38	3.08	3.60	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	ŧ			ጥኒ	ре			Majors	<b>:</b>
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 7			_					•			_			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera!	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	L6	Non-	-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El∈	ectiv	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer				1	4						
				? 1														

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Enrollment: 15

Ouestionnaires: 12

Page 362 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	12			Student	Course	Eval	uatio	on Qu	esti	onna	aire	
							Fre	equer	cies	;		Ins
		Ouestions	3		NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean

Quartiana	NR	NA	Fre	quer 2	ncies 3	5	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
Questions	NK	NA	т			4		mean	Rank	Mean	mean	mean	Mean	mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1263/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1347/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1252/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	0	6	1	3.27	1487/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	915/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1170/1512		3.72	4.10	4.11	3.67
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1410/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	4	5	1	0	2.42	1596/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	3	4	1	3.00	1515/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1556/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1532/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	2.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	1	4	0	2.50	1528/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1375/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	1.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1251/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1356/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	192/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	3	0	3	0	3.00	220/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	205/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	167/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	371/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.17

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	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	5	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0801 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: SUNKARA, NARESH (Instr. B)

Fall 2008

Page 363

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	q		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3	5		ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1263/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.92
		tor make clear			0	0	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1347/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.75
		estions reflec			0	1	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1252/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.36
		ations reflect			0	1	1	3	0	6	1	3.27	1487/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.27
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	915/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.91
				o what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	5	1		1170/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.67
		system clearl		ined	1	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1410/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.45
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1345/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.96
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	1488/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.17
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	n the subject	1	0	3	1	0	3	4	3.36	1545/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.18	
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	explained clearly	0	0	3	2	1	2	4	3.17	1478/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	2.96	
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	1	1	3	2	0	2	3	3.00	1479/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.75
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	our understanding	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	3.00	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1375/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	1.67
				ed to participate	9	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1251/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	3.33
				nd open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1356/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	2.00
		chniques succe		-	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	***
		Labora	torv															
1. Did th	e lab inc		-	of the material	6	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	192/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.50
				ground information	6	0	0	3	0	3	0	3.00	220/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.00
				for lab activities	6	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	205/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.33
		tructor provid			6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	167/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.83
		-		early specified	6	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	371/ 555		4.09	4.29	4.22	4.17
				Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	5			Ty	oe.			Majors	1
00-27	0	A 0		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0		
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 5	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				Ι 0		Ot:	her					5						
				? 0														

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

SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 364

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 15
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

1

Quebeleine	1100 1			Bouderro coo				J	20001	01111								
							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
1 544		General		. +b:	0	0	0	1	4	7	2	2 00	1251/1640	2 0 5	2 06	4 20	4 27	2 00
		w insights,skil tor make clear			0	0	0	0	4 4	7	4		1351/1649 1124/1648		3.96 3.88	4.28	4.27 4.18	3.80 4.00
		estions reflect	_		0	5	1	0	2	5			1138/1375		3.57			
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	5	6			1161/1595		3.74		4.22	
				what you learned	0	0	1	0		7			1084/1533		3.69	4.04	4.05	3.73
				what you learned	0	2	0	3	0	5			994/1512		3.72			3.73
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	4	5	-		947/1623			4.16	4.11	4.13
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	0	2	-		731/1646		4.83		4.67	
				ning effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6			1060/1621					
9. HOW WOL	iia you g	rade the overa.	II teaci	ing effectiveness	3	1	U	U	3	O	۷	3.91	1000/1021	3.10	3.04	4.00	4.02	3.12
		Lecture	е															
		ctor's lectures		0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1050/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.35	
		tor seem intere		0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1212/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.72	
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	1001/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.05
		s contribute to	_		0	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1216/1559		3.79			2.88
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	0	8	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1282/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	4.50
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1		4.25	831/1382		3.84	4.29	4.37	
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2		4.50			3.63		4.39	4.50
		chniques succes			11	2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 948			3.95	4.00	****
		- ,																
1 544 444	. 1 -1- 2	Laborat	_		_	0	^	^	-	4	4	4 22	00/001	2 00	4 1 4	4 16	4 07	4 22
		rease understar			6	0	0	0	1	4		4.33	99/ 221			4.16	4.07	
				ground information	6	0	0	1 1	1	3			150/ 243		4.03	4.12	3.89	4.11
		materials avail		or lab activities	6 6	0 0	0 1	0	2 1	2			156/ 212 151/ 209			4.40		4.00
		_		ance early specified	6	0	1	1	1	3		3.67			4.25	4.35	4.12	
	1				_	-	_	_	_	-			,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 A 3		Rec	 miire	 ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	 Graduat		0	Majo	 r	1	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 0	B 8		1000	1411	_u (	)	، ۱۰			Gradat	_	J	1.10.10		_
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0									_				-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	4						
				. 1														

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 365

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: XIE, MIN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General	0								Rank	Mean	rican	rican	Mean	Mean
General	0													
**************************************	0	•		_		_						4 00		
	_	0	0	1	4	7	3		1351/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0	-	0	0	0	4	./	4		1124/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0	-	5	1	0	2	5	2		1138/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0	-	0	0	0	5	6	4		1161/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0		0	1	0	4	-7	3		1084/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0	-	2	0	3	0	5	5	3.92		3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0		0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	. ,	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled 0	-	0	0	0	0	_	13		731/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3	3	0	1	6	5	0	0	2.33	1603/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4	4	0	3	3	3	2	Λ	2 36	1559/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4	4	0	1	4	2	2	1		1566/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4	_	0	5	2	4	0	0		1562/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4		2	4	2	3	0	0		1554/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5	-	9	1	0	0	0	0		****/1352			3.98	3.97	
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding 5	5	9	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/1352	3.00	3.00	3.90	3.31	2./1
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	831/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	654/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful 11	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
T albana kanna														
Laboratory	_	0	0	^	1	4	4	4 22	00/001	2 00	1 1 1	1 10	4 07	4 22
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6		0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6		0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	150/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6		0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6	-	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	151/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6	6	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	458/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.67
Frequenc	.су	Distr	ribu	tion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1001 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 366

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Enrollment: 18 Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2 1 6 4 3 3.31 1545/1649 3.85 3.96 4.28 4.27 3.31 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 7 4 4 3.69 1395/1648 3.70 3.88 4.23 4.18 3.69 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4 3 5 3 1 2.63 1363/1375 3.24 3.57 4.27 4.22 2.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 2 4 3 3 1 2.77 1569/1595 3.51 3.74 4.20 4.21 2.77 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 2 8 0 4 3.13 1415/1533 3.65 3.69 4.04 4.05 3.13 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 5 3 4 1 2.93 1452/1512 3.45 3.72 4.10 4.11 2.93 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 4 5 2 4 3.25 1485/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 7 6 3 0 2.65 1573/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 2.79 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 8 2 2 3 2.88 1539/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 3.17 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 10 1 3 2 2.81 1568/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 3.11 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 5 6 1 3 3.00 1496/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 3.13 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 5 6 1 2 2 2.38 1535/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 2.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 9 1 1 1 1 3 3.57 1016/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 1 1 1 2 3.33 1159/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11 3.33 0 2 3.17 1298/1382 3.84 3.84 4.29 4.37 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 3 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 02 1 0 3 3.67 1129/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 3.67 4. Were special techniques successful 11 3 0 1 0 0 2 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11 0 0 3 0 1 2 3.33 202/221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 3.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 2 0 0 4 4.00 155/243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 4.00 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 1 1 2 2 3.83 180/ 212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 3.83 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 11 0 0 2 2 0 2 3.33 201/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 3.33 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 388/555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22 4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1001 University of Maryland
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: BHAGCHANDANI, Y (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18
Ouestionnaires: 17

Fall 2008
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 367

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2 1 6 4 3 3.31 1545/1649 3.85 3.96 4.28 4.27 3.31 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 7 4 4 3.69 1395/1648 3.70 3.88 4.23 4.18 3.69 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4 3 5 3 1 2.63 1363/1375 3.24 3.57 4.27 4.22 2.63 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 2 4 3 3 1 2.77 1569/1595 3.51 3.74 4.20 4.21 2.77 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 2 8 0 4 3.13 1415/1533 3.65 3.69 4.04 4.05 3.13 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 5 3 4 1 2.93 1452/1512 3.45 3.72 4.10 4.11 2.93 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 4 5 2 4 3.25 1485/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1 4 7 3 1 2.94 1525/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 2.79 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 4 8 1 3.47 1468/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 3.17 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 1 0 8 4 2 3.40 1543/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 3.11 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 1 8 3 2 3.27 1457/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 3.13 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 4 5 3 1 2.80 1513/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 2.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 11 1 0 0 1 1 3.33 \*\*\*\*/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 1 1 1 2 3.33 1159/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11 3.33 0 2 3.17 1298/1382 3.84 3.84 4.29 4.37 3.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 3 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 02 1 0 3 3.67 1129/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 3.67 4. Were special techniques successful 11 3 0 1 0 0 2 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11 0 0 3 0 1 2 3.33 202/221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 3.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 2 0 0 4 4.00 155/243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 4.00 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 1 1 2 2 3.83 180/212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 3.83 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 11 0 0 2 2 0 2 3.33 201/209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 3.33 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 388/555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22 4.00 Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	10	-			
				2	1						

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

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 368

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					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	Λ	1	5	2	2	2 67	1429/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	2	2		1546/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	2		1305/1375	3.70	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	2		1510/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	2	1		1441/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	5			1356/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	2	0		1462/1623	3.52	3.74	4.16	4.08	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.16	4.67	5.00
-	0	0	7	0	3	2	12		1/1646	3.18	3.64		4.02	2.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	/	U	3	2	U	2.00	1010/1021	3.18	3.04	4.06	4.02	2.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	7	0	2	3	3.08	1511/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	3	0	5	3.50	1538/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	5	3	1	3.17	1478/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	0	2	3	2.92	1500/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	201/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	490/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.00
	-	_	-	=	=	_	-		,				. ==	
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	6	=			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1101 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 369

	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	0	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1429/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	1546/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	2	3.17	1305/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1510/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	2	1	3.00	1441/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1356/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	3	2	3.33	1462/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	9	1	1	3.17	1473/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	1279/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1463/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1219/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1246/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	99/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.14	4.10	3.89	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.03	4.12	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	201/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	U	1	1	1	U	3.00	490 / 555	3.90	4.25	4.29	4.22	3.00
J. Were requirements for rap reports creatry specified	9	U	U		1		U	5.00	490/ 333	3.90	4.03	4.43	7.22	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	0						

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

Fall 2008

Page 370

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructo: Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		 Genera																	
1. Did you	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	803/1	1610	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.39				
2. Did the	0	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	,		3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.22				
3. Did the	0	2	0	1	6	4	5		1081/1		3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.81				
		tions reflect			0	3	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	970/1		3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.13
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	740/1		3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.12
	-	_		to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	2	7	4.00			3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	4.00
		system clearl			1	0	1	1	6	3	6		1299/1		3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.71
		as class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00		L646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	0	0	3	7	4	3	1		1582/1		3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.31
		Lectur	·e																
1. Were th	he instruc	tor's lecture		prepared	0	0	1	4	4	2	7	3.56	1450/1	1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.93
				in the subject	0	0	1	3	4	2	8		1520/1		3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.11
				explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	5	4		1411/1		3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.85
		contribute t			0	1	4	3	1	3	6		1443/1		3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.68
				our understanding	0	14	0	0	2	1	1		****/		3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****
1 - 1 - 1	1.4	•	-	•	-	_	0	2 00			2 14	2 50	4 00	4 11	****				
1. Did cla	14 15	0	1	0	1	2	0		****/			3.52	4.08	4.11	****				
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion							1	0	1	0	1		****/		3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
				nd open discussion	15 15	0 2	1	0	1 1	0	1		****/ <u>1</u>		3.49 ****	3.63	4.30	4.39 4.00	****
4. were sp	pecial tec	hniques succe	essiui		15	2	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	***/	948		3.50	3.95	4.00	* * * *
		Labora	itory																
1. Did the	e lab incr	ease understa	nding o	of the material	9	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	99/	221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.33
				ground information	9	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	110/	243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33
				for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	99/	212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.56
		ructor provid			9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	72/	209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.67
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	8	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	380/	555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.10
		Semina	ır																
1. Were as	ssigned to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	88	****	4.33	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the	e instruct	or available	for inc	dividual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****
5. Were co	riteria fo	or grading mad	le clear	2	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	ı										
Goodin D		G GD3		Book and a discolar				D										N	
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA	\ · – – – – – -	Expected Grades					asons					Тур	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	S	0	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 6															
56-83 6 2.00-2.99 4 C 0							nera.	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	8	Non-	major	18
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 4 D 0																			
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				0			Means t			_	h
	P 0					-						_	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otł	ner				1	6							
				? 0															

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County HOUPT, JOSH (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Instructor: HOUPT, JOSH (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18
Ouestionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 371

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 3 11 4.39 803/1649 3.85 3.96 4.28 4.27 4.39 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 3 11 4.39 803/1649 3.85 3.96 4.28 4.27 4.39 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 3 10 4.22 931/1648 3.70 3.88 4.23 4.18 4.22 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 6 4 5 3.81 1081/1375 3.24 3.57 4.27 4.22 3.81 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 1 3 4 7 4.13 970/1595 3.51 3.74 4.20 4.21 4.13 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 3 5 8 4.12 740/1533 3.65 3.69 4.04 4.05 4.12 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 1 5 2 7 4.00 883/1512 3.45 3.72 4.10 4.11 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 6 3 6 3.71 1299/1623 3.52 3.84 4.16 4.08 3.71 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.83 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 0 5 3 9 4.06 886/1621 3.18 3.64 4.06 4.02 3.31 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 00 3 5 8 4.31 1070/1568 3.57 4.13 4.43 4.39 3.93 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 6 9 4.50 1241/1572 3.63 4.23 4.70 4.64 4.11 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 1 10 5 4.25 939/1564 3.50 3.90 4.28 4.25 3.85 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 3 5 7 4.13 1060/1559 3.22 3.79 4.29 4.23 3.68 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1352 3.00 3.60 3.98 3.97 \*\*\*\* Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 2 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 3.14 3.52 4.08 4.11 \*\*\*\* 1 15 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 3.84 3.84 4.29 4.37 \*\*\*\* 0 1 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1368 3.49 3.63 4.30 4.39 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 4. Were special techniques successful 15 2 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.00 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 0 1 0 0 6 4.33 99/ 221 3.92 4.14 4.16 4.07 4.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 110/243 3.82 4.03 4.12 3.89 4.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  $9 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 6 \quad 4.56$ 99/ 212 4.07 4.30 4.40 4.21 4.56 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 72/ 209 3.98 4.25 4.35 4.12 4.67 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 2 1 1 6 4.10 380/555 3.90 4.09 4.29 4.22 4.10 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.54 4.63 \*\*\*\* 0 0 1 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.55 \*\*\*\* 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.83 3.68 3.58 \*\*\*\* 16 1 0 Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6							
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	16					
				2	0							

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

Title Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

56-83

84-150

Grad.

4

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

1

C 1

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

- ·				
Ctudont	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

Page 372

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Non-major 10

								T	equer				T to at 4		G	Damb	IIMDG	T 1	0
		Ouestion	g			MR	NA	1	equei 2	3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	.1																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1037/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.18
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goal	ls	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	873/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.27
		estions reflec				0	3	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1112/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.75
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goal	ls	0	1	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you le	earned	0	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	815/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you	learned	0	3	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1042/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.88
7. Was th	ne gradinç	g system clearly	y expla	ained		0	1	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1180/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.90
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you ç	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effect	tiveness	0	0	4	2	3	2	0	2.27	1606/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.45
		Lectur	e																
1 Were t	the instri	actor's lecture		nrenared		0	0	1	2	3	1	Δ	3 45	1470/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
		ctor seem inter			ect	0	0	1	4	1	1			1550/1572		4.23	4.70		3.82
		terial presente		_		0	0	0	5		3			1475/1564		3.90	4.28		3.97
		es contribute to				0	1	2	2	3	1			1503/1559		3.79	4.29		3.74
		l techniques en				1	9	0	0	0	1			****/1352		3.60		3.97	****
J. Dia at	2010115001	. ccciniiques em	nance y	your underst	Janaing	_		O	Ü	O	_	Ü	1.00	/1332	3.00	3.00	3.70	3.77	
		Discus																	
		ussions contrib				9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1384					****
		nts actively en				9	0	0	0	0	0			****/1382		3.84	4.29		****
		ctor encourage		nd open disc	cussion	9	0	0	0	0	0			****/1368		3.63	4.30		****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	sstul			9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	***	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	tory																
1. Did th	he lab ind	crease understa	nding (	of the mate	rial	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	84/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.43
2. Were y	you prović	ded with adequa	te back	kground info	ormation	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	121/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.29
3. Were r	necessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab act:	ivities	4	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	195/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.57
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provid	e assis	stance		4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	136/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.29
5. Were m	requiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly spec	ified	4	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	371/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.17
					Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Farnod	Cum. GPA		Evnocto	d Grades				P.C.	aara				т	no			Majors	,
crears F		Cuiii. GPA		Expected						asons	, 			Ту:	 he			Majors 	, 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ion	s	Λ	Graduat	_	0	Majo	r)	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5		1.0.	-1 ca	ca i	) I 1·10	·JOI	5	U	Graduat	C	0	Tiu je	<i></i>	_

General

Other

Electives

0

7

Under-grad 11

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

Title Baltimore County Instructor: ZIMMERMANN, SAR (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

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

Page 373

FEB 11, 2009

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		Genera	_		0	0	0	0	2	г	1	1 10	1027/1640	2 05	2 06	4 20	4 07	1 10
		w insights,ski tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2 3	5 2	4 6		1037/1649 873/1648	3.85 3.70	3.96 3.88	4.28	4.27 4.18	4.18 4.27
		estions reflec			0	3	1	0	1	4	2		1112/1375	3.70	3.57	4.23	4.10	3.75
		ations reflect			0	1	1	0	1	4	4		1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	815/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00
				o what you learned	0	3	1	1	0	2	4		1042/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.88
		system clearl			0	1	0	0	4	3	3		1180/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.90
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	7		261/1621		3.64	4.06	4.02	3.45
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
		tor seem inter			3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1339/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.82
				xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	342/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.97
		s contribute t			3	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	618/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.74
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were a	ll student	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	-	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understa	nding c	f the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	84/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.43
				ground information	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	121/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.29
3. Were n	ecessary i	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	4	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	195/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	3.57
4. Did th	e lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	136/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.29
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	4	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	371/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.17
				Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	
				7. 4														
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		ке	quire	ed I	or Ma	jors	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		~		ı				0	TT7	1	1	37-		1.0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad I	1	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		m.7						0	инии ,	VI	h			la.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0 P 0		上1	ectiv	/es				0	#### - 1				_	11
				I 0		O+1	h o					7	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcar	lL	
				5 0 T 0		Utl	her					1						
				: U														

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401 University of Maryland ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Title Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	 1															
1	Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	2	3	1	3	3	3 17	1580/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.17
			ctor make clear			0	0	1	4	4	3	0		1617/1648		3.88	4.23	4.18	2.75
			uestions reflec			0	1	4	5	1	1	0		1373/1375			4.27	4.22	1.91
			uations reflect			0	4	2	2	2	2	0		1583/1595		3.74	4.20	4.21	2.50
					what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	2	2		1426/1533		3.69	4.04	4.05	3.08
					o what you learned	0	2	1	2	6	0	1		1476/1512		3.72	4.10	4.11	2.80
			g system clearl			0	0	1	3	5	3	0	2.83	1567/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	2.83
8.	How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
					hing effectiveness	0	0	3	1	7	0	1	2.58	1579/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.75
			Lectur	e															
1.	Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	s well ;	prepared	0	0	2	0	7	2	1	3.00	1515/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	3.23
2.	Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	2	0	9	0	1	2.83	1568/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.14
3.	Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	1520/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.20
4.	Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	3	2	5	1	1	2.58	1524/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	2.79
5.	Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	8	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1301/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.50
			Labora																
1.	Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	f the material	3	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	210/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.22
2.	Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	3	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	225/ 243		4.03	4.12	3.89	2.89
3.	Were ne	ecessary	materials avail	lable f	or lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	156/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00
			structor provid			4	0	1	0	3	3	1		198/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	3.38
5.	Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	482/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.33
			Semina																
5.	Were cr	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
					Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utior	n									
Cre	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00	 -27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28	-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			_			-								
56	-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	11
84	-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Gr	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
					I 0		Ot1	ner				1	.0						

Page 374

FEB 11, 2009

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

Title Baltimore County Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain ne	ew insights,ski	=	m this course	0	0	2	3	1	3	3	3.17	1580/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.17
		tor make clear			0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1617/1648		3.88	4.23	4.18	2.75
3. Did	the exam qu	estions reflec	the e	xpected goals	0	1	4	5	1	1	0	1.91	1373/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	1.91
4. Did	other evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	1583/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	2.50
5. Did a	assigned re	adings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	1426/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.08
6. Did v	written ass	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	0	2	1	2	6	0	1	2.80	1476/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	2.80
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	1	3	5	3	0	2.83	1567/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	2.83
8. How t	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How v	would you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	2	1	4	4	0	2.91	1535/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	2.75
		Lectur	2															
		actor's lecture			1	0	0	1	4	6	0		1470/1568		4.13	4.43	4.39	3.23
		tor seem inter		3	1	0	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1540/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.14
		-		xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	3	1	3.50	1388/1564		3.90	4.28	4.25	3.20
		es contribute to		-	1	0	1	2	4	4	0		1479/1559		3.79	4.29	4.23	2.79
5. Did a	audiovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.50
		Labora	tory															
		rease understa	_		3	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	210/ 221		4.14	4.16	4.07	3.22
				ground information	3	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	225/ 243		4.03	4.12	3.89	2.89
	_			or lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	156/ 212		4.30	4.40	4.21	4.00
		structor provid			4	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.30	198/ 209		4.25	4.35	4.12	3.38
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	482/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.33
		Semina	=															
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			_			-						,		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	0						

Page 375

FEB 11, 2009

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1501 University of Maryland FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 376

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County Fall 2008 Instructor:
Enrollment: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A)
16

Furoriment.	10			
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	ലോല	ncies			Tnei	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
		Genera	 al															
1. Did	l you gain n	new insights,ski	ills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	912/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.31
2. Did	l the instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1010/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.15
		questions reflec			0	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1071/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.83
4. Did	l other eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did	l assigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	815/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00
6. Did	l written as	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1202/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.60
7. Was	the gradin	ng system clearl	ly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1149/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92
8. How	many times	was class cand	celled		1	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	1	5	3	2	2	2.92	1528/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.81
		Lectur	re															
1. Wer	e the instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1483/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.07
2. Did	l the instru	ctor seem inter	rested	in the subject	0	0	0	2	4	1	6	3.85	1504/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.38
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1403/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.15
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute t	to what	you learned	0	0	4	1	2	3	3	3.00	1479/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79
5. Did	l audiovisua	ıl techniques er	nhance	your understanding	0	8	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1270/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.78
		Labora	atory															
1. Did	l the lab in	crease understa	anding	of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	64/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Wer	e you provi	ded with adequa	ate bac	kground information	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33
3. Wer	e necessary	materials avai	ilable	for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	105/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.50
4. Did	l the lab in	structor provid	de assi	stance	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.83
5. Wer	re requireme	ents for lab rep	ports c	learly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	238/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.80
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Crodit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	`	Expected Grades				Po:	asons				Тът	no			Majors	,
		Cuiii. GPF		Expected Grades					250115 	·			Ту	 he			majors 	, 
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 3				_										
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nerai	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	. 3	Non-	-major	13

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	10				
				?	1						

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

Instructor: YUANYUAN, LIU (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 377

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Λ	0	Λ	2	5	6	4.31	912/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	4		1010/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	3		1071/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	3		1067/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	815/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	1	3		1202/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	3		1149/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	207/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	480/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	234/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	607/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1277/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	64/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	110/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	105/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	238/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.80

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	10	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Baltimore County

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 378

FEB 11, 2009

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		Genera ew insights,ski	_	+b-i	0	0	1	0	0	9	7	4.24	006/1640	2 05	2 06	4.28	4 07	1 21
		ew insights,ski ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	10	3		986/1649 1245/1648	3.85 3.70	3.96 3.88	4.28	4.27 4.18	4.24
		uestions reflec			0	1	1	3	5	6	1		1300/1375	3.70	3.57	4.23	4.10	3.19
		uations reflect			0	7	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	890/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.22	4.20
				what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	3	7		1065/1533	3.65	3.69	4.20	4.05	3.75
				to what you learned	1	5	1	1	4	3	2		1334/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.36
		g system clearl		2	1	0	3	0	1	9	2		1363/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.56
		was class canc		ained	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	0	0	5	5	4	2	1		1601/1621		3.64	4.06	4.02	3.62
J. 110W WO	ara you s	grade the overa	II ccac	shing circuitveness	Ü	O	3	5	_	2	_	2.55	1001/1021	3.10	3.01	1.00	1.02	3.02
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	2	3	1	8	3	3.41	1478/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	1	3	1	3	9	3.94	1480/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33
		-		explained clearly	0	0	1	3	6	5	2	3.24	1464/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.97
		es contribute t			0	1	5	1	3	3	4		1479/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.81
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	12	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus	gion															
1 Did ala	ace dieci			what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	Λ	3 50	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
				ed to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
				nd open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
		echniques succe		id open discussion	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
						_		-		_	_		, , ,					
		Labora	-															
		crease understa			8	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	114/ 221	3.92		4.16	4.07	4.22
				kground information	8	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	204/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.56
				for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	147/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.11
		structor provid			8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	99/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.56
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	8	2	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	388/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	ason	c			Ту	ne			Majors	
										- 								. – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 4														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot!	her				1	.0						
				? 1														

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601 University of Maryland Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 379

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Instructor: WAUCHOPE, ORRET (Instr. B) Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

0

0

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	1		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	1	0	0	9	7	4.24	986/1649	3 85	3.96	4.28	4 27	4.24
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	10	3		1245/1648		3.88	4.23	4.18	3.88
		uestions reflect	_	_	0	1	1	3	5	6	1		1300/1375		3.57	4.27	4.22	3.19
		uations reflect			0	7	0	1	0	5	_	4.20	890/1595			4.20	4.21	4.20
		eadings contribu			1	0	1	3	2	3	7		1065/1533		3.69	4.04	4.05	3.75
	_	-		what you learned	1	5	1	1	4	3	2		1334/1512		3.72	4.10	4.11	3.36
		g system clearly		-	1	0	3	0	1	9	3		1363/1623		3.84	4.16	4.08	3.56
		was class cance		ilea	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69		5.00
				ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	101/1621		3.64			3.62
y. 110	ara you	grade one everar		ang cricotiveness	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	Ū	Ü	_		1.00	101,1021	3.10	3.01	1.00	1.02	3.02
		Lecture	:															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	424/1568	3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.10
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1003/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	plained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.25	3.97	
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	ou learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	573/1559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	3.81	
		ur understanding	4	10	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	****		
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu			15	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/1384			4.08	4.11	****
		nts actively enc			15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382		3.84	4.29	4.37	****
		_		open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1368		3.63	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	sful		15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.00	****
		Laborat	oru															
1 Did th	e lah in	crease understan	-	the material	8	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	114/ 221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	4.22
			_	round information	8	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	204/ 243	3.82	4.03	4.12		3.56
				r lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11			4.30	4.40	4.21	4.11
		structor provide			8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	99/ 209	3.98	4.25	4.35	4.12	4.56
		nts for lab repo			8	2	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	388/ 555		4.09	4.29	4.22	4.00
J. Were I	equiteme	ics for tab repo	ics cie	arry specified	O	2	U	_	U	7	2	4.00	300/ 333	3.90	4.00	1.27	7.22	1.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re:	ason	g			Ty	ne			Majors	:		
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra												ту					, 
00-27								ed f	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0							1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	: enouç	jh
			D 0										1					

Other

10

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN (Instr. A) Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 13

Page 380 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eval	uation	Questio	onnaire
---------	--------	------	--------	---------	---------

									ncies		_		tructor		Course	-		Level	
		Question 	S 		NR 	NA	1 	2	3	4 	5 	Mean	Ran	.K.	меап 	Mean	Mean	Mean	mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did	you gain :	new insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1464/1	649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.62
2. Did	the instr	uctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	2	3.85	1279/1	648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.85
3. Did	the exam	questions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1308/1	375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.15
4. Did	other eva		the exp	pected goals	0	1	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1490/1	595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.25
5. Did	assigned	readings contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1119/1	533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.69
				what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1345/1	512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.33
		ng system clearl		_	0	0	1	2	5	3	2		1489/1		3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.23
	_	s was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	0	12		765/1		4.95		4.69	4.67	
				ning effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	2			1415/1						
_		Lectur	_				_				_								
		ructor's lecture			0	0	1	0	2	4	6		1248/1		3.57	4.13	4.43	4.39	4.41
		uctor seem inter			0	0	2	0	1	5	5		1504/1		3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.99
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly bid the lectures contribute to what you learned hid and explained transport to the lecture of the lectu					0	1	1	1	7			1292/1		3.50	3.90		4.25	4.07
4. Did	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	4	6	2	3.62	1340/1	559	3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	4.00
5. Did	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					7	3	0	0	3	0	2.50	1301/1	352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.50
1 544	alaaa dia	what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/1	201	2 1/	3.52	4.08	4.11	****		
					12	0	0	0		0	0							4.11	****
				d to participate d open discussion	12	0	0	0	1 0	1	0		****/1 ****/1			3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. DIG	the instr	uctor encourage	Lair and	i open discussion	12	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	~~~/1	308	3.49	3.03	4.30	4.39	
		Labora	tory																
1. Did	the lab i	ncrease understa	nding o	f the material	3	0	3	0	0	6	1	3.20	212/	221	3.92	4.14	4.16	4.07	3.20
				ground information	3	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	199/		3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.60
				or lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	2	-	4.20	139/			4.30	4.40	4.21	4.20
		nstructor provid			3	0	0	0	2	2		4.40	116/		3.98	4.25		4.12	4.40
		ents for lab rep			3	0	1	0	2	3	4		428/		3.90	4.09		4.22	
J. WELE	requirem	circb for tab fep	OICD CI	edily bpecified	3	Ü	-	Ü	-	5	-	3.70	1207	333	3.70	1.05	1.27	1.22	3.90
		Semina	r																
5. Were	criteria	for grading mad	e clear		11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
				Frequ	encv	Dig	trib	ıtior	1										
				11040	.01107	210	0110		-										
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 S	0	Grad	uate	 e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55						_				J							3		
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde	r-ai	rad 1	3	Non-	major	11
84-150												-				-		5 2	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	####	- 1	Means t	here a	are not	enone	h
	P 0											-			es to b			_	
				I O		O+1	her					9	resp	0110	co b	2 5191			
				? 1		001						-							
				• ±															

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 381

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WAUCHOPE, ORRET (Instr. B) Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Overtion	~		MD	NT7		equei 2	ncies 3	4	_	Ins Mean	tructor		Dept		Level	
		Questions 	5 		NK	NA	т			4		mean	Rank 	mean 	Mean	Mean	Mean 	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1464/1649	3.85	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.62
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	2	3.85	1279/1648	3.70	3.88	4.23	4.18	3.85
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	t the ex	spected goals	0	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1308/1375	3.24	3.57	4.27	4.22	3.15
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1490/1595	3.51	3.74	4.20	4.21	3.25
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1119/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.05	3.69
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.45	3.72	4.10	4.11	3.33
	_	g system clearly		ined	0	0	1	2	5	3	2		1489/1623	3.52	3.84	4.16	4.08	3.23
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	1	0			765/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.85
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1621	3.18	3.64	4.06	4.02	3.90
		Lecture	e															
		uctor's lecture:	_	_	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	480/1568	3.57		4.43	4.39	4.41
		ctor seem inter		_	5	0	0	1	1	2			1442/1572	3.63	4.23	4.70	4.64	3.99
		_		plained clearly	5 5	0	0	0	2	1			812/1564		3.90	4.28	4.25	4.07
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38		3.22	3.79	4.29	4.23	4.00
5. Did aud	diovisua	our understanding	5	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1352	3.00	3.60	3.98	3.97	2.50		
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to w	what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	3.14	3.52	4.08	4.11	****
		-	_	l to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1382	3.84	3.84	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	3.49	3.63	4.30	4.39	****
		Labora	_															
		crease understa			3	0	3	0	0	6		3.20	212/ 221		4.14	4.16	4.07	3.20
				ground information	3	0	2	0	1	4		3.60		3.82	4.03	4.12	3.89	3.60
	-			or lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	2		4.20	139/ 212	4.07	4.30	4.40	4.21	4.20
		structor provide			3	0	0	0	2	2		4.40	116/ 209		4.25	4.35	4.12	4.40
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	428/ 555	3.90	4.09	4.29	4.22	3.90
		Semina	r															
5. Were ci	riteria :	for grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.58	****
				Frequ	ency.	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2		
28-55	2	B 3		~ .		1				0	TT7		2	<b>N</b> T		11		
56-83	2 0	2.00-2.99	2 2	C 1 D 0		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad I	.3	Non-	-major	11
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2	D 0 F 0		. דיקו	ecti <sup>.</sup>					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -			h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	۷	P 0		F.T.	ectl.	ves				U	respons				_	11
				I 0		<b>∩</b> +1	her					9	respoils	es co L	e sign	ıııcdı	10	
				? 1		ULI	TICT					J						
				; ±														

Course-Section: CHEM 405 0101
Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Title INORGANIC CHEMIS Instructor: DANIEL, MARIE-C

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 382 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	2	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	_		Mean	
		Genera	_		_		•	_	_	_							4 00	4 50	
		w insights,ski			2	0	0	2	7	5	8		1303/1		3.86		4.28	4.50	3.86
		tor make clear			2	0	1	2	4	8	7		1304/1		3.82	3.88	4.23	4.36	3.82
		estions reflec			2	0	2	2	5	4	9		1127/1		3.73	3.57	4.27	4.48	3.73
		ations reflect			2	6	0	2	2	6	6		1067/1		4.00	3.74	4.20		4.00
				what you learned	2	2	2	2	5	7			1283/1		3.45	3.69	4.04	4.14	
		_		o what you learned	2	7	0	2	2	5	6		883/1		4.00	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.00
		system clearl		ined	2	0	0	2	4	7			1009/1		4.05	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.05
	-	was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	16			1384/1		4.27	4.83	4.69		4.27
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	3	2	5	8	2	3.20	1463/1	L621	3.20	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.20
		Lectur	0																
1 Were ti	he instru	ctor's lecture		orenared	2	0	0	2	3	7	10	1 11	1213/1	1568	4.14	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.14
		n the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5			1203/1		4.55	4.23	4.70		4.55		
		xplained clearly	2	0	3	3	6	6			1467/1		3.23	3.90	4.28	4.40	3.23		
		you learned	2	0	4	2	4	5	_		1407/1		3.41		4.29		3.41		
		-	2	4	4	3	3	4			,								
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand							3	3	4	4	3.06	1213/1	L35Z	3.06	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.06
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	21	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1	L384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	***
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1	1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	***
				d open discussion	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1	L368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****
		chniques succe			21	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/	948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****
	_																		
		Labora	-																
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	555	***	4.09	4.29	4.41	***
		Semina	r																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	- e clear		23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	288	****	3.83	3.68	3.71	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utior	1										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								asons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	;
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8							ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	Τ	Grad	duate	9	5	Majo	or	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		~	_					1			, .				_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 3	C 3		Ger	neral	L				1	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	L9	Non-	-major	6
84-150	9	D 0								_			_						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		E⊥∈	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1			Means t			_	ın
				P 0							_	0	resp	ponse	es to b	oe sign	niticar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				2	0							

0

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 0101
Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY

INORGANIC CHEMISTRY
SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Instructor: SZALAI,

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 383 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane:	ncie	s		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	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1124/1648		3.88	4.23	4.36	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	950/1375		3.57	4.27	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50			3.74	4.20	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1				3.69	4.04	4.14	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512		3.72	4.10	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50			3.84	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1				3.64	4.06	4.24	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.25	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572		4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564		3.90	4.28	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559		3.79	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50				3.98	4.07	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.35	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382		3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368		3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00
	_	-	-		-		_		_,					
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.73	5.00
<del>-</del>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243		4.14	4.12	4.73	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212		4.30	4.12	4.57	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212		4.30			5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555		4.25	4.35	4.63 4.41	4.50
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	U	U	U	U	U	1	Τ	4.50	293/ 333	4.50	4.09	4.29	4.41	4.50
Seminar		•				_		4 00	=4.4 00	4 00				
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.33	4.54	4.66	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 85		5.00	4.47	4.54	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.57	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	66/ 92		4.50	4.35	4.44	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.83	3.68	3.71	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52		3.25	4.06	4.86	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	25/ 48		3.02	4.09	4.42	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39		5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39		5.00	4.38	4.59	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	4.38	3.68	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53		3.70	4.30	4.64	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 30		3.72	4.16	4.24	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41		4.04	4.43	4.84	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24		4.18	4.42	4.85	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	3.82	3.99	4.22	5.00

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 0101 University of Maryland Page 383 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 0101 Untitle INORGANIC CHEMISTRY

University of Maryland Baltimore County

INORGANIC CHEMISTRY Baltimore Count
MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Instructor:

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 384 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies	5	-		tructor		Dept			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.25	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0		1279/1568	4.25	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	3.90	4.28	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1559	5.00	3.79	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	690/1352	4.25	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.35	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.73	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.03	4.12	4.61	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.30	4.40	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.25	4.35	4.63	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.09	4.29	4.41	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.33	4.54	4.66	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.54	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.57	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1 1	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.50	4.35	4.44	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Т	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.83	3.68	3.71	4.00
Field Work	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	1 / 50	F 00	2 05	1 06	4 06	F 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	3.25	4.06	4.86	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	25/ 48	4.00	3.02	4.09	4.42	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		1/ 39 1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00 5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1 1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	,	5.00 5.00	5.00	4.38	4.59	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	Т	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	4.38	3.68	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 53	5.00	3.70	4.30	4.64	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 30	4.00	3.72	4.16	4.24	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 41		4.04	4.43	4.84	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.18	4.42	4.85	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	3.82	3.99	4.22	5.00

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 0101 University of Maryland Title

INORGANIC CHEMISTRY Baltimore County Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 384

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: CHEM 420 0101

Title COMPUTER APPL IN CHEM

Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 12

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 385 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questic	onnai	re
-----------------------------------	-------	----

			Fre	equer	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	_	0	_	2	-		4	2 55	1256/1640	2 55	2 06	4 00	4 50	2 55
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	Τ	4	4		1376/1649		3.96	4.28		3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	Ι	3	4	4		1218/1648	3.92	3.88	4.23		3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	./	0	0	0	3	2		665/1375	4.40	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	3		1010/1595	4.10	3.74	4.20		4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	1	3	2		1441/1533	3.00	3.69	4.04		3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	883/1512		3.72	4.10		4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	1.00	,	4.33	3.84	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12		1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.67
T a selection														
Lecture	-	0	_	1	_	_	-	2 26	1405 (1560	2 26	4 10	4 42	4 = 4	2 26
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	Ι	6	3			1485/1568			4.43	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	Ι	3	7		1203/1572		4.23	4.70	4.79	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5			1407/1564		3.90	4.28	4.40	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	3		1344/1559	3.60	3.79	4.29		3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	879/1352	3.80	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.80
Diamondo.														
Discussion	11	0	1	0	0	^	^	1 00	<b>++++</b> /1204		2 50	4 00	4 25	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	Ţ	0	0	0			****/1384				4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	4.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.73	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212		4.30	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209			4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	тТ	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 209		4.25	4.35	4.03	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 432 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED BIOCHEMISTRY Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: GARCIN, ELSA

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 386

Job IRBR3029

Ceneral								Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 230,1649 4.86 3.96 4.28 4.50 4.87 1 2.00 the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 300/1648 4.71 3.88 4.23 4.36 4.71 3.01 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 641/1375 4.43 3.57 4.27 4.48 4.43 4.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 4.57 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 4.57 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 230,1649 4.86 3.96 4.28 4.50 4.87 1 2.00 the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 300/1648 4.71 3.88 4.23 4.36 4.71 3.01 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 641/1375 4.43 3.57 4.27 4.48 4.43 4.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 4.57 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 4.57 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			 Genera	 1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 641/1375 4.43 3.57 4.27 4.48 4.42 4.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 545/1533 4.33 3.69 4.04 4.14 4.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 6.00 6.00 6	1. Did you	u gain n			m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	230/1649	4.86	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 417/1595 4.57 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 4.33 545/1533 4.33 3.69 4.04 4.14 4.35 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 2 4.29 780/1623 4.29 3.84 4.16 4.27 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 316/1568 4.86 4.13 4.43 4.54 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 216/1564 4.86 3.90 4.28 4.04 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 216/1564 4.86 3.90 4.28 4.04 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 261/1559 4.86 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	_	_	J ,			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1648				4.36	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 545/1533 4.33 3.69 4.04 4.14 4.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.27 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.26 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.26 4.33 2.00 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	641/1375	4.43	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 263/1512 4.67 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 2 4.29 780/1623 4.29 3.84 4.16 4.27 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 316/1568 4.86 4.13 4.43 4.54 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 216/1564 4.86 3.90 4.28 4.40 4.86 4.13 the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 216/1564 4.86 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 261/1559 4.86 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 261/1559 4.86 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 3.52 4.08 4.35 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 8.28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7 86-8-8 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7 86-8-8 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	417/1595	4.57	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 5 2 4.29 780/1623 4.29 3.84 4.16 4.27 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36 4.3	5. Did as:	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	545/1533	4.33	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 748/1646 4.86 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 4.33 595/1621 4.33 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.33  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 316/1568 4.86 4.13 4.43 4.54 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 216/1564 4.86 3.90 4.28 4.40 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 261/1559 4.86 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 263/1352 4.57 3.60 3.98 4.07 4.57 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 3.52 4.08 4.35 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1385 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1385 5.00 3.63 3.43 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1385 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0	6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1512	4.67	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.67
Lecture	7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	780/1623	4.29	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.29
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. Discussion  1. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  7. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  8. Did the instructor encouraged to participate  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  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  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. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9. Discussion  1. Did class discussions of 1/1384  1. Did clas	8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	748/1646	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.86
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 316/1568 4.86 4.13 4.43 4.54 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 4.28 4.40 4.86 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.23 4.70 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 216/1564 4.86 3.90 4.28 4.40 4.86 4.01 the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 261/1559 4.86 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 263/1352 4.57 3.60 3.98 4.07 4.57  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 3.52 4.08 4.35 5.00 3. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7			Lectur	е															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 216/1564 4.86 3.90 4.28 4.40 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 261/1559 4.86 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 263/1352 4.57 3.60 3.98 4.07 4.57 Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 3.52 4.08 4.35 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1388 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 261/1559 4.86 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 263/1352 4.57 3.60 3.98 4.07 4.57  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 3.52 4.08 4.35 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/948 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 263/1352 4.57 3.60 3.98 4.07 4.57  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 3.52 4.08 4.35 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/948 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564	4.86	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.86
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 3.52 4.08 4.35 5.00  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00  4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/948 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1559	4.86	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.86
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 3.52 4.08 4.35 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	263/1352	4.57	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1382 5.00 3.84 4.29 4.56 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1368 5.00 3.63 4.30 4.58 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/948 5.00 3.50 3.95 4.31 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00
Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.50	3.95	4.31	5.00
00-27					Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7	00-27	0	0 00-0 99		 Δ 1		 Red	anir	ed f	 or Ma	iore		0	Graduat		n	 of Ma		n
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 7							1/6/	darr.	cu I	J⊥ 110	. 101 5	,	J	Graduat	-	J	Ma Ju		U
		-					Ger	nera	1				3	IInder-a	rad	7	Non-	maior	7
84-150 3 3 00-3 49 3 D 0	84-150						061	иста.	-				5	JIIGCI - 9.	Luu	,	14011		,
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough							Ele	ecti	ves				Ω	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
P 0 responses to be significant	orua.	J	3.30 1.00	_	= *								-					_	,
I 0 Other 2							Otl	her					2	10050110					

? 2

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 387

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 437 0101 University of Maryland FEB 11, 2009 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM Job IRBR3029 KARPEL, RICHARD (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment:	173			
Questionnaires:	73	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

6

Grad.

3.50-4.00 13

F 1

I 0

2

								_	ncie		_		tructor	Course	_			
		Question	.S 		NR	NA	1 	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls from	this course	1	0	2	4	10	27	29	4.07	1142/1649	4.07	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.07
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	2	0	2	12	18	24	15	3.54	1471/1648	3.54	3.88	4.23	4.36	3.54
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the exp	pected goals	3	0	3	14	16	16	21	3.54	1192/1375	3.54	3.57	4.27	4.48	3.54
		uations reflect			1	24	2	9	13	7	17		1377/1595		3.74	4.20	4.36	3.58
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to w	nat you learned	4	5	1	7	14	18	24	3.89	925/1533	3.89	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.89
		_		what you learned	. 3	18	0	4	15	19	14		1075/1512		3.72	4.10	4.26	3.83
		g system clearl		ned	4	1	1	6	20	22	19		1264/1623	3.76	3.84	4.16	4.27	3.76
	-	was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	16	54		881/1646		4.83	4.69	4.71	4.77
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	9	1	9	18	19	14	3	2.75	1562/1621	3.41	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.41
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well p	repared	3	0	3	9	22	19	17	3.54	1452/1568	4.04	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.04
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	3	0	3	4	11	19	33	4.07	1453/1572	4.34	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.34
3. Was 1	ecture ma	terial presente	d and exp	plained clearly	3	0	7	19	15	17	12	3.11	1487/1564	3.73	3.90	4.28	4.40	3.73
4. Did tl	he lectur	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	3	0	14	9	19	12	16	3.10	1468/1559	3.73	3.79	4.29	4.41	3.73
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	4	6	9	9	12	15	18	3.38	1109/1352	3.75	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to w	nat you learned	67	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****
		nts actively en			66	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	****/1382	***	3.84	4.29	4.56	***
3. Did tl	he instru	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	66	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	***
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	66	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	***
		Labora	torv															
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts clea	arly specified	71	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.41	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors fo	r all the	e students	72	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****
				Freq	uency	y Dis	strik	outic	n									
Q		Comp. CD3		Ermonted Condon				ъ.		_			m				M =	
crearrs 1	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected								ason	.b 			Ту	 be			Majors 	; 
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A 15		Re	equir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	6	Majo	or	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 21				_				_			_			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C 14		Ge	enera	ιŢ				3	Under-g	rad 6	7	Non-	-major	66
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	9	D 1														

Electives

Other

1

53

Course-Section: CHEM 437 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 173 Ouestionnaires: 73

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 388 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2 4 10 27 29 4.07 1142/1649 4.07 3.96 4.28 4.50 4.07 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 2 12 18 24 15 3.54 1471/1648 3.54 3.88 4.23 4.36 3.54 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 0 3 14 16 16 21 3.54 1192/1375 3.54 3.57 4.27 4.48 3.54 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 24 2 9 13 7 17 3.58 1377/1595 3.58 3.74 4.20 4.36 3.58 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 5 1 7 14 18 24 3.89 925/1533 3.89 3.69 4.04 4.14 3.89 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 18 0 4 15 19 14 3.83 1075/1512 3.83 3.72 4.10 4.26 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 4 1 1 6 20 22 19 3.76 1264/1623 3.76 3.84 4.16 4.27 3.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 16 54 4.77 881/1646 4.77 4.83 4.69 4.71 4.77 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 2 0 0 11 35 16 4.08 870/1621 3.41 3.64 4.06 4.24 3.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 6 0 0 0 7 17 43 4.54 815/1568 4.04 4.13 4.43 4.54 4.04 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 1 2 19 46 4.62 1133/1572 4.34 4.23 4.70 4.79 4.34 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 3 5 26 34 4.34 854/1564 3.73 3.90 4.28 4.40 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 3 8 18 39 4.37 871/1559 3.73 3.79 4.29 4.41 3.73 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 7 1 4 9 19 27 4.12 624/1352 3.75 3.60 3.98 4.07 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 67 0 0 2 4 0 0 2.67 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 3.52 4.08 4.35 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 66 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 3.84 4.29 4.56 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 66 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 \*\*\*\*/1368 \*\*\*\* 3.63 4.30 4.58 \*\*\*\*

4. Were special techniques successful 66 6 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* / 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.31 \*\*\*\* Laboratory

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 71 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.09 4.29 4.41 \*\*\*\*

Self Paced

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 72 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 110 \*\*\*\* 3.82 3.99 4.22 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	 А	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	14	General	3	Under-grad	67	Non-major	66
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	53	_			
				?	2						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 389

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A) Fall 2008
Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								Fr	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I																
1 Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this co	irce	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	644/1649	4.56	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.50
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	427/1648	4.81	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.61
		uestions reflect				0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	733/1375	4.55	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.33
	_	uations reflect				0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	722/1595	4.32	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.33
		eadings contrib				0	6	1	3	2	2	4		1310/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.42
	_	signments contri		_		0	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	366/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.53
		g system clearly		-	ı rearneu	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	659/1623	4.54	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.33
	_	was class cance	-	ainea		0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.16	4.71	5.00
		grade the overal		hing offor	a+ i	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	133/1621		3.64	4.06	4.71	
9. HOW WC	outa you	grade the overa.	.i tead	ming erred	ctiveness	3	U	U	U	U	3	12	4.80	133/1021	4.29	3.04	4.06	4.24	4.40
		Lecture	3																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared		1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	273/1568	4.64	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.74
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				iect	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.53	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.72
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear				clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	326/1564	4.46	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.76
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	463/1559	4.52	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.71
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	3	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	221/1352	4.46	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.64
		Discus																	
		ussions contrib		_		16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****
		nts actively end	_	_	-	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****
		ctor encourage i		nd open dis	scussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	ssful			16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	***	3.50	3.95	4.31	****
		Laborat	orv																
1 Did th	ne lah in	crease understar	-	of the mate	arial	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	23/ 221	4.86	4.14	4.16	4.73	4.80
		ded with adequat				3	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	16/ 243	4.84	4.03	4.12	4.61	4.93
_	_	materials avail		-		3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	36/ 212		4.30	4.40	4.57	4.87
	_	structor provide			CIVICIES	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	21/ 209	4.88	4.25	4.35	4.63	4.93
					nified	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	272/ 555		4.09	4.29	4.41	4.67
J. Wele i	. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified				JILIEU	J	U	U	U	U	J	10	4.07	272/ 333	1.05	4.00	1.27	1.11	4.07
	F					ıency	Dis	trib	utior	า									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Rea	asons	5			Ту	oe.			Majors	
00-27	-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 11						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	major	18

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. B)

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Enrollment: 18
Ouestionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 390

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 7 10 4.50 644/1649 4.56 3.96 4.28 4.50 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 5 12 4.61 427/1648 4.81 3.88 4.23 4.36 4.61 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 7 9 4.33 733/1375 4.55 3.57 4.27 4.48 4.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 1 6 10 4.33 722/1595 4.32 3.74 4.20 4.36 4.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 1 3 2 2 4 3.42 1310/1533 3.71 3.69 4.04 4.14 3.42 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 6 10 4.53 366/1512 4.50 3.72 4.10 4.26 4.537. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 5 10 4.39 659/1623 4.54 3.84 4.16 4.27 4.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.83 4.69 4.71 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 4 6 4 4.00 914/1621 4.29 3.64 4.06 4.24 4.40 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 13 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 731/1568 4.64 4.13 4.43 4.54 4.74 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 12 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 1241/1572 4.53 4.23 4.70 4.79 4.72 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 \*\*\*\*/1564 4.46 3.90 4.28 4.40 4.76 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 \*\*\*\*/1559 4.52 3.79 4.29 4.41 4.71 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1352 4.46 3.60 3.98 4.07 4.64 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 3.52 4.08 4.35 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1382 \*\*\*\* 3.84 4.29 4.56 \*\*\*\* 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/1368 \*\*\*\* 3.63 4.30 4.58 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 04. Were special techniques successful 16 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 3.50 3.95 4.31 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 23/ 221 4.86 4.14 4.16 4.73 4.80 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.93 16/ 243 4.84 4.03 4.12 4.61 4.93 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 0 2 13 4.87 36/ 212 4.77 4.30 4.40 4.57 4.87 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 21/ 209 4.88 4.25 4.35 4.63 4.93 3 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.93

#### Frequency Distribution

3 0 0 0 0 5 10 4.67 272/555 4.83 4.09 4.29 4.41 4.67

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				2	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr.

TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 391 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1649	4.56	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1648	4.81	3.88	4.23	4.36	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	283/1375	4.55	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	759/1595	4.32	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	815/1533	3.71	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	436/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	284/1623	4.54	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	94/1621	4.29	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1568	4.64	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	4.53	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1564	4.46	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	4.52	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	91/1352	4.46	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 221	4.86	4.14	4.16	4.73	4.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	35/ 243	4.84	4.03	4.12	4.61	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	86/ 212	4.77	4.30	4.40	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	40/ 209	4.88	4.25	4.35	4.63	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	4.83	4.09	4.29	4.41	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12 12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92 ****/ 288	****	4.50	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	^^^^/ 288	***	3.83	3.68	3.71	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		,	****	4.18	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

Frequency Distribution

Page 391

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201 University of Maryland

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR Baltimore County

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 392 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General						_								
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1649	4.56	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.62
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1648	4.81	3.88	4.23	4.36	5.00
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0 3	3 3	10 7	4.77	283/1375	4.55	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.77
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	4	4.31	759/1595 815/1533	4.32 3.71	3.74 3.69	4.20	4.36 4.14	4.31
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	436/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.46
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	284/1623	4.54	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.69
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	4			1375/1621		3.64			4.18
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1248/1568	4.64	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.54
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	8	1	3.69	1522/1572	4.53	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.35
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	5	2	3.62	1356/1564	4.46	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.31
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	3	3.85	1226/1559	4.52	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.42
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	860/1352	4.46	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.38
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1384	****	3.52	4.08	4.35	****
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****
4.	Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 221	4.86	4.14	4.16	4.73	4.92
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	35/ 243	4.84	4.03	4.12	4.61	4.75
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	86/ 212	4.77	4.30	4.40	4.57	4.67
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	40/ 209	4.88	4.25	4.35	4.63	4.83
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	4.83	4.09	4.29	4.41	5.00
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.66	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.54	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.57	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.44	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.71	****
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	4.86	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.42	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.59	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.95	****
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.64	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.24	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.84	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.85	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 392 FEB 11, 2009 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	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CHEM 450 0101 CHEM HETERO COMPDS HOSMANE, RAMACH Fall 2008 18

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Laboratory

Page 393 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				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
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	212/1649	4.88	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.88
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	414/1648	4.63	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.63
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	380/1375	4.69	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.69
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.50
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	4	7	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.75
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	248/1512	4.69	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.69
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	164/1623	4.81	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.81
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	465/1646	4.94	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.94
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1621	5.00	3.64	4.06	4.24	5.00
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	372/1568	4.81	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.81
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	118/1564	4.94	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.94
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	306/1559	4.81	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.81
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352	4.40	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.40
	Discussion														
1	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	Ο	0	0	Ο	15	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.35	5.00
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00
	Were special techniques successful	1	12	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****

#### Frequency Distribution

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.09 4.29 4.41 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4 Required for Majors		0	Graduate	1	Major	7	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	15	Non-major	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 451 0101

MECH OF ORGANIC REACTI

Title

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 394 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		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	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	550/1649	4.58	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	599/1648	4.47	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	753/1375	4.32	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	552/1595	4.46	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	1	4	7	3.32	1344/1533	3.32	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	422/1512	4.47	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	502/1623	4.50	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1426/1646	4.21	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	348/1621	4.54	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	330/1568	4.84	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	511/1564	4.63	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	347/1559	4.79	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1113/1352	3.38	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	673/1384	4.25	3.52	4.08	4.35	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.71	3.84	4.29	4.56	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	3.63	4.30	4.58	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	389/ 948	4.14	3.50	3.95	4.31	4.14
*														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.14	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.03	4.12	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.25	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.09	4.29	4.41	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.33	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.54	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.83	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.25	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.02	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.38	3.68	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.70	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.72	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.04	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.18	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	3.82	3.99	4.22	****

Course-Section: CHEM 451 0101

Title MECH OF ORGANIC REACTI

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 394 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 470 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 TOXICOLOGICAL CHEMISTR

FISHBEIN, JAMES

Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 395

Job IRBR3029

2 11			Frequencies		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	Ω	Λ	Λ	1	5	14	4.65	446/1649	4.65	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	702/1648	4.40	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	412/1375	4.65	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	759/1595	4.30	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	9	7	4.11	748/1533	4.11	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	627/1512	4.30	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	815/1623	4.25	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	11		1148/1646	4.55	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	252/1621		3.64	4.06	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching ellectiveness		_	0	J	O	9		1.01	232/1021	1.01	3.01	1.00	1.21	1.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	147/1568	4.95	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	600/1564	4.55	3.90	4.28	4.40	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	318/1559	4.80	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	4	6	1	3.21	1173/1352	3.21	3.60	3.98	4.07	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	921/1384	3.83	3.52	4.08	4.35	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1382	****	3.84	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	20	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 490A 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County OPTICAL SPECTROSCOPY

Page 396 Title FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	5	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

3.50-4.00 2

Ρ

I

0

1

Grad.

4

Ouestions							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		General																
1. Did vou	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.50	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	216/1648	4.80	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.80
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	3.57	4.27	4.48	4.80
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1595	4.80	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.80
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1533	4.80	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.80
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.26	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1623	5.00	3.84	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1621	4.80	3.64	4.06	4.24	4.80
Lecture																		
1. Were th	nrenared	Ω	0	0	0	Ω	Ω	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.13	4.43	4.54	5.00			
	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.23	4.70	4.79	5.00			
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1564	5.00	3.90	4.28	4.40	5.00
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	3.79	4.29	4.41	5.00
				our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.60	3.98	4.07	5.00
		Discuss																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	3.52	4.08	4.35	4.80
		-	_	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.56	5.00
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1368	4.60	3.63	4.30	4.58	4.60
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sstul		1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****
	Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ation	ı												
						_												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	1	Graduat	е	4	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0 C 0				Gei	nera:	l				3	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														

Electives

Other

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CHEM 490B 0101 CHEMOMETRICS Fall 2008 FOUNTAIN, AUGUS 4

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

Page 397 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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	2	2	4.50	644/1649	4.50	3.96	4.28	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	3.88	4.23	4.36	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1112/1375	3.75	3.57	4.27	4.48	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	220/1623	4.75	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	3.64	4.06	4.24	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.13	4.43	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.23	4.70	4.79	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1388/1564	3.50	3.90	4.28	4.40	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	966/1559	4.25	3.79	4.29	4.41	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	515/1352	4.25	3.60	3.98	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	Λ	Λ	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	3.52	4.08	4.35	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	3.84	4.29	4.56	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	945/ 948	1.00	3.50	3.95	4.31	
•														
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.54	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.57	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.44	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.83	3.68	3.71	4.00
Frequ			rib	ution	ı									

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

Title CHEMISTRY SEMINAR Baltimore County Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI Fall 2008

Questionnaires: 2

Course-Section: CHEM 690 0101 University of Maryland Page 398 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	3.88	4.23	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.74	4.20	4.35	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.84	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	3.64	4.06	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.13	4.43	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1463/1572	4.00	4.23	4.70	4.83	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	3.90	4.28	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	3.79	4.29	4.41	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	Ο	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.33	4.54	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.83	3.68	3.87	4.00
5. Here erreerra for grading made erear	_	0	Ü	J	J	_	J	1.00	03/ 200	1.00	5.05	3.00	3.07	1.00

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