

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	11	11	18	4.12	1057/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	11	12	18	4.10	1050/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	8	13	17	4.05	982/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	7	9	11	3.93	1125/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	4	9	9	9	3.58	1171/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	1016/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	7	8	21	4.07	995/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	19	19	4.39	1170/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	0	5	10	13	4.17	767/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	30	4.74	497/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	5	31	4.72	980/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	12	24	4.54	589/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	7	6	26	4.43	785/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	4	3	6	23	4.33	480/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	3	9	15	3.82	920/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	5	9	16	4.06	904/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	12	12	3.85	1041/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	4	0	4	6	18	4.06	452/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	11	11	18	4.12	1057/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	11	12	18	4.10	1050/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	8	13	17	4.05	982/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	7	9	11	3.93	1125/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	4	9	9	9	3.58	1171/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	1016/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	7	8	21	4.07	995/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	19	19	4.39	1170/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	1	13	7	5	3.52	1266/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	876/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	1114/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	1044/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	3	5	6	7	3.81	1209/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	2	3	0	7	9	3.86	869/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	3	9	15	3.82	920/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	5	9	16	4.06	904/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	12	12	3.85	1041/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	4	0	4	6	18	4.06	452/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	11	11	18	4.12	1057/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	11	12	18	4.10	1050/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	8	13	17	4.05	982/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	7	9	11	3.93	1125/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	4	9	9	9	3.58	1171/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	1016/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	7	8	21	4.07	995/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	19	19	4.39	1170/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	1	8	12	3	3.71	1180/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	718/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	1114/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	1	2	13	4.39	792/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	944/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	6	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	728/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	3	9	15	3.82	920/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	5	9	16	4.06	904/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	12	12	3.85	1041/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	4	0	4	6	18	4.06	452/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	11	11	18	4.12	1057/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	11	12	18	4.10	1050/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	8	13	17	4.05	982/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	7	9	11	3.93	1125/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	4	9	9	9	3.58	1171/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	2	0	5	6	8	3.86	1016/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	7	8	21	4.07	995/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	19	19	4.39	1170/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	1	1	13	9	1	3.32	1341/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	718/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	1206/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	899/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1124/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	6	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	836/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	3	3	9	15	3.82	920/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	5	9	16	4.06	904/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	12	12	3.85	1041/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	4	0	4	6	18	4.06	452/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	42

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	2	19	20	9	3.52	1404/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	7	15	9	21	3.74	1314/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	5	3	14	19	12	3.57	1226/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	17	3	3	11	8	11	3.58	1338/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	14	4	3	11	7	11	3.50	1216/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	1	4	4	11	4	3.54	1193/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	2	11	14	22	4.02	1042/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	32	17	4.29	1248/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	3	13	20	10	3.80	1118/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	1	2	12	34	4.47	887/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	6	42	4.80	839/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	3	12	10	24	4.06	1056/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	10	11	25	4.16	997/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	2	5	7	9	21	3.95	782/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	11	16	15	3.83	920/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	2	14	10	15	3.67	1102/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	1	11	17	11	3.68	1114/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	4	4	10	7	18	3.72	629/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	5	A	10	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	2	19	20	9	3.52	1404/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	7	15	9	21	3.74	1314/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	5	3	14	19	12	3.57	1226/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	17	3	3	11	8	11	3.58	1338/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	14	4	3	11	7	11	3.50	1216/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	1	4	4	11	4	3.54	1193/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	2	11	14	22	4.02	1042/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	32	17	4.29	1248/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	6	1	2	16	15	3	3.46	1291/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	4	5	7	18	4.06	1189/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	2	5	5	27	4.46	1213/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	3	4	9	6	8	3.40	1329/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	1	5	3	7	7	7	3.28	1347/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	3	5	5	7	4	7	3.11	1186/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	11	16	15	3.83	920/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	2	14	10	15	3.67	1102/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	1	11	17	11	3.68	1114/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	4	4	10	7	18	3.72	629/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	5	A	10	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	2	19	20	9	3.52	1404/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	7	15	9	21	3.74	1314/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	5	3	14	19	12	3.57	1226/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	17	3	3	11	8	11	3.58	1338/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	14	4	3	11	7	11	3.50	1216/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	1	4	4	11	4	3.54	1193/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	2	11	14	22	4.02	1042/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	32	17	4.29	1248/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	3	2	1	12	18	4	3.57	1251/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	1	7	8	14	4.17	1138/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	7	6	24	4.46	1221/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	1	2	8	6	9	3.77	1222/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	3	8	7	8	3.57	1282/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	4	2	2	7	6	6	3.52	1053/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	11	16	15	3.83	920/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	2	14	10	15	3.67	1102/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	1	11	17	11	3.68	1114/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	4	4	10	7	18	3.72	629/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	5	A	10	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	2	19	20	9	3.52	1404/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	7	15	9	21	3.74	1314/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	5	3	14	19	12	3.57	1226/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	17	3	3	11	8	11	3.58	1338/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	14	4	3	11	7	11	3.50	1216/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	27	1	4	4	11	4	3.54	1193/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	2	11	14	22	4.02	1042/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	32	17	4.29	1248/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	1	1	2	19	15	4.21	722/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	1	5	8	17	4.32	1029/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	3	7	28	4.66	1055/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	1	5	5	16	4.33	843/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	1013/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	3	2	2	5	6	9	3.75	937/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	11	16	15	3.83	920/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	2	14	10	15	3.67	1102/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	1	11	17	11	3.68	1114/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	4	4	10	7	18	3.72	629/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	5	A	10	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	56	Non-major	55
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	13	16	22	4.00	1140/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	2	11	15	24	4.00	1113/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	4	6	17	25	4.09	957/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	3	4	10	14	13	3.68	1291/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	5	4	14	6	15	3.50	1216/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	19	2	4	7	6	15	3.82	1040/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	1	7	19	24	4.11	959/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	36	14	4.21	1332/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	2	7	26	10	3.91	1032/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	2	8	40	4.54	818/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	2	2	9	39	4.57	1141/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	2	5	13	29	4.27	899/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	3	1	3	11	32	4.36	846/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	2	6	12	28	4.31	504/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	9	8	7	24	3.68	1002/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	8	12	27	4.08	900/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	2	17	9	20	3.70	1110/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	9	1	12	9	17	3.50	719/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	2 A 14	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 15	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	54
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	13	16	22	4.00	1140/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	2	11	15	24	4.00	1113/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	4	6	17	25	4.09	957/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	3	4	10	14	13	3.68	1291/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	5	4	14	6	15	3.50	1216/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	19	2	4	7	6	15	3.82	1040/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	1	7	19	24	4.11	959/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	36	14	4.21	1332/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	5	3	15	16	4	3.26	1361/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	2	4	12	14	4.19	1126/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	2	2	5	10	18	4.08	1373/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	1	4	6	9	12	3.84	1188/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	2	2	6	3	8	13	3.75	1226/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	6	2	7	2	6	11	3.61	1024/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	9	8	7	24	3.68	1002/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	8	12	27	4.08	900/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	2	17	9	20	3.70	1110/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	9	1	12	9	17	3.50	719/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	2 A 14	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 15	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	54
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	13	16	22	4.00	1140/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	2	11	15	24	4.00	1113/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	4	6	17	25	4.09	957/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	3	4	10	14	13	3.68	1291/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	5	4	14	6	15	3.50	1216/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	19	2	4	7	6	15	3.82	1040/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	1	7	19	24	4.11	959/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	36	14	4.21	1332/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	6	19	15	4.23	710/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	1013/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	4	8	18	4.39	1268/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	713/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	644/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	8	1	3	2	2	11	4.00	728/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	9	8	7	24	3.68	1002/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	8	12	27	4.08	900/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	2	17	9	20	3.70	1110/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	9	1	12	9	17	3.50	719/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	2 A 14	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 15	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	54
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	13	16	22	4.00	1140/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	2	11	15	24	4.00	1113/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	4	6	17	25	4.09	957/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	3	4	10	14	13	3.68	1291/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	5	4	14	6	15	3.50	1216/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	19	2	4	7	6	15	3.82	1040/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	1	7	19	24	4.11	959/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	36	14	4.21	1332/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	5	15	21	4.39	506/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	887/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	4	10	16	4.32	1295/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	772/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	785/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	8	1	2	3	2	11	4.05	701/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	9	8	7	24	3.68	1002/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	8	12	27	4.08	900/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	2	17	9	20	3.70	1110/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	9	1	12	9	17	3.50	719/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	2 A 14	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 15	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	54
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	7	3	30	17	3.95	1195/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	28	21	4.14	1016/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	13	17	22	3.90	1092/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	3	0	10	15	11	3.79	1219/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	6	13	10	12	3.56	1184/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	3	1	7	11	7	3.62	1157/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	13	10	29	4.07	995/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	34	23	4.40	1163/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	2	7	19	18	4.09	858/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	10	42	4.60	746/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	6	47	4.70	996/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	4	12	36	4.33	843/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	4	10	38	4.52	655/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	11	13	29	4.24	553/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	10	4	17	17	3.40	1116/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	10	2	6	16	23	3.70	1085/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	8	4	19	9	17	3.40	1188/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	7	6	11	9	21	3.57	699/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	23	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	7	3	30	17	3.95	1195/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	28	21	4.14	1016/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	13	17	22	3.90	1092/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	3	0	10	15	11	3.79	1219/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	6	13	10	12	3.56	1184/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	3	1	7	11	7	3.62	1157/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	13	10	29	4.07	995/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	34	23	4.40	1163/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	2	11	23	7	3.75	1149/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	2	0	3	10	27	4.43	942/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	2	2	12	25	4.38	1268/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	4	3	3	9	20	3.97	1104/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	2	1	2	4	10	19	4.22	951/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	7	0	3	5	8	15	4.13	654/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	10	4	17	17	3.40	1116/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	10	2	6	16	23	3.70	1085/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	8	4	19	9	17	3.40	1188/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	7	6	11	9	21	3.57	699/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	23	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	7	3	30	17	3.95	1195/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	28	21	4.14	1016/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	13	17	22	3.90	1092/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	3	0	10	15	11	3.79	1219/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	6	13	10	12	3.56	1184/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	3	1	7	11	7	3.62	1157/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	13	10	29	4.07	995/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	34	23	4.40	1163/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	0	2	25	15	4.31	616/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	0	3	5	27	4.58	758/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	7	6	24	4.46	1221/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	3	10	19	4.32	853/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	770/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	7	0	0	6	5	14	4.32	488/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	10	4	17	17	3.40	1116/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	10	2	6	16	23	3.70	1085/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	8	4	19	9	17	3.40	1188/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	7	6	11	9	21	3.57	699/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4 A 23	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0 B 24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1 C 6	General	3	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	7	3	30	17	3.95	1195/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	28	21	4.14	1016/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	13	17	22	3.90	1092/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	3	0	10	15	11	3.79	1219/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	6	13	10	12	3.56	1184/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	3	1	7	11	7	3.62	1157/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	13	10	29	4.07	995/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	34	23	4.40	1163/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	1	0	5	19	17	4.21	722/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	2	0	3	6	25	4.44	920/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	0	4	6	26	4.51	1176/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	2	1	2	9	20	4.29	882/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	2	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	741/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	8	0	1	6	3	14	4.25	539/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	10	4	17	17	3.40	1116/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	10	2	6	16	23	3.70	1085/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	8	4	19	9	17	3.40	1188/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	7	6	11	9	21	3.57	699/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	23	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	3	8	7	18	3.67	1350/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	7	8	20	3.93	1202/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	2	5	10	20	3.98	1028/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	3	4	5	8	13	3.73	1267/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	2	1	6	9	10	3.86	991/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	891/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	0	6	7	24	4.23	820/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	21	16	4.43	1132/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	2	9	14	10	3.68	1191/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	2	3	33	4.48	887/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	2	7	31	4.55	1155/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	5	10	24	4.26	908/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	2	3	4	28	4.30	894/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	5	0	2	6	20	4.09	679/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	5	7	17	3.73	977/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	5	6	20	4.00	926/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	1	9	5	18	3.86	1033/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	5	3	5	2	17	3.72	633/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	43	Non-major	42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	3	8	7	18	3.67	1350/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	7	8	20	3.93	1202/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	2	5	10	20	3.98	1028/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	3	4	5	8	13	3.73	1267/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	2	1	6	9	10	3.86	991/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	891/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	0	6	7	24	4.23	820/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	21	16	4.43	1132/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	13	13	7	3.71	1173/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	0	4	5	22	4.36	997/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	3	1	6	4	19	4.06	1375/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	1	4	8	17	4.16	1000/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	5	3	3	2	19	3.84	1188/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	6	6	0	7	2	10	3.40	1093/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	5	7	17	3.73	977/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	5	6	20	4.00	926/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	1	9	5	18	3.86	1033/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	5	3	5	2	17	3.72	633/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	43	Non-major	42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	3	8	7	18	3.67	1350/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	7	8	20	3.93	1202/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	2	5	10	20	3.98	1028/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	3	4	5	8	13	3.73	1267/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	2	1	6	9	10	3.86	991/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	891/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	0	6	7	24	4.23	820/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	21	16	4.43	1132/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	3	5	6	14	5	3.39	1316/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	6	0	4	4	14	3.71	1325/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	4	3	4	4	13	3.68	1414/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	3	1	5	8	10	3.78	1218/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	5	2	2	3	14	3.73	1232/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	7	5	0	5	3	5	3.17	1170/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	5	7	17	3.73	977/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	5	6	20	4.00	926/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	1	9	5	18	3.86	1033/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	5	3	5	2	17	3.72	633/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	3 A 20	Required for Majors	35 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 6	General	4 Under-grad 43 Non-major 42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			1 P 1		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			4 ? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	3	8	7	18	3.67	1350/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	7	8	20	3.93	1202/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	2	5	10	20	3.98	1028/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	3	4	5	8	13	3.73	1267/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	12	2	1	6	9	10	3.86	991/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	18	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	891/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	0	6	7	24	4.23	820/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	21	16	4.43	1132/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	5	16	12	4.21	722/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	3	0	4	2	19	4.21	1107/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	1	4	4	18	4.32	1295/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	5	4	17	4.33	843/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	3	2	2	0	18	4.12	1029/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	6	4	0	4	3	8	3.58	1035/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	5	7	17	3.73	977/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	5	6	20	4.00	926/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	1	9	5	18	3.86	1033/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	5	3	5	2	17	3.72	633/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	43	Non-major	42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	17	0	1	3	3	19	6	3.81	1275/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	1	8	16	8	3.94	1191/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	1	2	4	17	9	3.94	1061/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	9	0	5	4	11	4	3.58	1338/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	6	0	3	4	10	9	3.96	895/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	14	0	2	7	2	7	3.78	1075/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	2	6	10	14	4.13	946/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	1152/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	1	1	9	7	7	3.72	1167/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	1	3	5	24	4.58	770/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	917/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	3	7	5	18	4.15	1000/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	6	7	18	4.24	937/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	1	2	6	4	18	4.16	614/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	4	4	9	8	3.37	1127/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	1	10	7	10	3.73	1071/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	4	10	7	7	3.43	1182/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	4	1	4	6	12	3.78	608/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	12
		Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0
				Major	2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General		2	Under-grad	49		Non-major		47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		2						
				?	17									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	17	0	1	3	3	19	6	3.81	1275/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	1	8	16	8	3.94	1191/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	1	2	4	17	9	3.94	1061/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	9	0	5	4	11	4	3.58	1338/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	6	0	3	4	10	9	3.96	895/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	14	0	2	7	2	7	3.78	1075/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	2	6	10	14	4.13	946/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	1152/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	1	2	11	7	1	3.23	1369/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	1163/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	1252/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	1	0	4	7	2	3.64	1266/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1343/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	0	3	0	4	5	3	3.33	1116/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	4	4	9	8	3.37	1127/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	1	10	7	10	3.73	1071/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	4	10	7	7	3.43	1182/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	4	1	4	6	12	3.78	608/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 7	0.00-0.99 2	A 12	Required for Majors 26	Graduate 0	Major 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General		2	Under-grad	49		Non-major		47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		2						
				?	17									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	17	0	1	3	3	19	6	3.81	1275/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	1	8	16	8	3.94	1191/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	1	2	4	17	9	3.94	1061/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	9	0	5	4	11	4	3.58	1338/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	6	0	3	4	10	9	3.96	895/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	14	0	2	7	2	7	3.78	1075/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	2	6	10	14	4.13	946/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	1152/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	3	4	7	5	2	2.95	1418/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	38	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	****/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	1183/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	38	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	****/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	****/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	38	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	****/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	4	4	9	8	3.37	1127/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	1	10	7	10	3.73	1071/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	4	10	7	7	3.43	1182/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	4	1	4	6	12	3.78	608/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	12
		Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0
				Major	2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General		2	Under-grad	49		Non-major		47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		2						
				?	17									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	17	0	1	3	3	19	6	3.81	1275/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	1	8	16	8	3.94	1191/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	1	2	4	17	9	3.94	1061/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	9	0	5	4	11	4	3.58	1338/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	6	0	3	4	10	9	3.96	895/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	14	0	2	7	2	7	3.78	1075/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	2	6	10	14	4.13	946/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	1152/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	2	3	8	7	1	3.10	1397/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	38	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	****/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	1244/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	38	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	****/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	38	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	****/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	4	4	9	8	3.37	1127/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	1	10	7	10	3.73	1071/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	4	10	7	7	3.43	1182/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	4	1	4	6	12	3.78	608/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	12
			Required for Majors	26	Graduate
				0	Major
					2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	56
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General		2	Under-grad	49		Non-major		47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		2						
				?	17									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	8	20	20	4.04	1121/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	12	13	22	3.96	1157/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	12	17	22	4.15	907/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	2	13	16	8	3.63	1316/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	4	3	15	9	12	3.51	1209/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	26	1	3	6	12	2	3.46	1236/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	11	16	21	4.12	946/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	1	19	28	4.51	1052/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	5	24	12	4.12	833/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	10	35	4.61	718/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	6	39	4.75	917/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	5	16	27	4.46	698/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	6	13	28	4.42	800/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	1	4	14	25	4.36	464/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	3	4	22	11	3.57	1049/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	7	6	14	14	3.66	1106/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	2	11	13	15	3.80	1063/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	5	0	6	11	16	3.87	569/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	5	A	15	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	8	20	20	4.04	1121/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	12	13	22	3.96	1157/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	12	17	22	4.15	907/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	2	13	16	8	3.63	1316/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	4	3	15	9	12	3.51	1209/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	26	1	3	6	12	2	3.46	1236/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	11	16	21	4.12	946/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	1	19	28	4.51	1052/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	2	5	12	15	1	3.23	1369/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	2	3	9	23	4.34	1013/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	6	11	20	4.29	1311/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	2	9	14	11	3.86	1178/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	3	6	13	12	3.83	1193/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	1	6	5	10	10	3.69	983/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	3	4	22	11	3.57	1049/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	7	6	14	14	3.66	1106/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	2	11	13	15	3.80	1063/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	5	0	6	11	16	3.87	569/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	5	A	15	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	8	20	20	4.04	1121/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	12	13	22	3.96	1157/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	12	17	22	4.15	907/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	2	13	16	8	3.63	1316/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	4	3	15	9	12	3.51	1209/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	26	1	3	6	12	2	3.46	1236/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	11	16	21	4.12	946/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	1	19	28	4.51	1052/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	2	0	0	6	11	4	3.90	1046/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	38	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	702/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	38	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	1090/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	40	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	823/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	667/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	38	3	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	****/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	3	4	22	11	3.57	1049/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	7	6	14	14	3.66	1106/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	2	11	13	15	3.80	1063/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	5	0	6	11	16	3.87	569/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	5	A	15	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	8	20	20	4.04	1121/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	12	13	22	3.96	1157/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	12	17	22	4.15	907/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	2	13	16	8	3.63	1316/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	4	3	15	9	12	3.51	1209/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	26	1	3	6	12	2	3.46	1236/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	11	16	21	4.12	946/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	1	19	28	4.51	1052/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	5	0	0	6	4	1	3.55	****/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	44	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	****/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	44	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	****/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	46	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	****/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	****/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	46	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	3	4	22	11	3.57	1049/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	7	6	14	14	3.66	1106/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	2	11	13	15	3.80	1063/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	5	0	6	11	16	3.87	569/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	5	A	15	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	13	16	29	4.10	1084/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	7	27	23	4.05	1085/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	12	20	24	4.02	997/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	2	3	14	14	13	3.72	1274/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	1	6	10	12	13	3.71	1099/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	39	1	6	8	6	0	2.90	1368/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	2.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	14	13	28	4.05	1011/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	35	23	4.40	1170/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	1	15	18	19	3.98	938/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	8	49	4.72	553/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	12	46	4.73	964/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	7	9	39	4.41	757/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	3	4	12	37	4.42	785/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	1	6	14	33	4.34	480/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	6	12	13	19	3.54	1061/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	5	7	10	33	4.18	852/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	5	12	9	24	3.71	1102/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	6	7	6	10	22	3.69	648/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1 A 19	Required for Majors	46	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1 B 20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	5	Under-grad	63	Non-major	62
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4 D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	13	16	29	4.10	1084/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	7	27	23	4.05	1085/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	12	20	24	4.02	997/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	2	3	14	14	13	3.72	1274/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	1	6	10	12	13	3.71	1099/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	39	1	6	8	6	0	2.90	1368/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	2.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	14	13	28	4.05	1011/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	35	23	4.40	1170/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	5	3	5	22	8	5	3.16	1383/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	3	1	3	14	20	4.15	1151/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	1	4	2	11	22	4.23	1332/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	3	4	9	6	14	3.67	1259/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	5	5	3	7	15	3.63	1267/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	2	3	4	5	6	14	3.75	937/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	6	12	13	19	3.54	1061/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	5	7	10	33	4.18	852/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	5	12	9	24	3.71	1102/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	6	7	6	10	22	3.69	648/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1 A 19	Required for Majors	46
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1 B 20		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 9		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	13	16	29	4.10	1084/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	7	27	23	4.05	1085/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	12	20	24	4.02	997/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	2	3	14	14	13	3.72	1274/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	1	6	10	12	13	3.71	1099/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	39	1	6	8	6	0	2.90	1368/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	2.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	14	13	28	4.05	1011/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	35	23	4.40	1170/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	1	0	9	17	15	4.07	864/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	1	1	7	23	4.63	702/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	4	9	19	4.47	1213/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	0	4	7	19	4.50	625/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	633/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	4	1	1	3	4	15	4.29	511/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	6	12	13	19	3.54	1061/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	5	7	10	33	4.18	852/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	5	12	9	24	3.71	1102/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	6	7	6	10	22	3.69	648/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1 A 19	Required for Majors	46
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1 B 20		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 9		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	13	16	29	4.10	1084/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	7	27	23	4.05	1085/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	12	20	24	4.02	997/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	2	3	14	14	13	3.72	1274/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	1	6	10	12	13	3.71	1099/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	39	1	6	8	6	0	2.90	1368/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	2.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	14	13	28	4.05	1011/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	35	23	4.40	1170/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	1	0	5	14	22	4.33	579/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	620/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	5	9	18	4.41	1260/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	589/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	567/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	4	1	1	2	4	16	4.38	448/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	6	12	13	19	3.54	1061/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	5	7	10	33	4.18	852/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	5	12	9	24	3.71	1102/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	6	7	6	10	22	3.69	648/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Talley,Daniel

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1 A 19	Required for Majors	46	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1 B 20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	5	Under-grad	63	Non-major	62
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4 D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	4	13	20	18	3.70	1333/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	7	22	21	3.83	1262/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	8	9	19	20	3.76	1162/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	2	3	9	16	13	3.81	1207/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	9	6	6	10	13	3.27	1308/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	3	2	5	8	11	3.76	1088/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	3	20	30	4.22	820/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	0	2	34	19	4.31	1239/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	2	5	7	29	8	3.71	1180/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	6	20	29	4.18	1126/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	6	7	42	4.42	1252/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	5	8	19	24	3.90	1160/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	4	9	13	24	4.02	1072/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	6	2	7	16	23	3.89	849/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	2	13	18	18	3.61	1032/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	4	7	16	28	4.02	922/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	6	14	12	22	3.68	1118/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	12	3	10	9	22	3.46	743/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	7	A	17	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	5	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	3	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	4	13	20	18	3.70	1333/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	7	22	21	3.83	1262/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	8	9	19	20	3.76	1162/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	2	3	9	16	13	3.81	1207/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	9	6	6	10	13	3.27	1308/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	3	2	5	8	11	3.76	1088/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	3	20	30	4.22	820/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	0	2	34	19	4.31	1239/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	6	0	13	22	9	3.56	1251/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	4	3	5	16	20	3.94	1244/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	3	3	6	11	24	4.06	1375/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	5	2	7	15	18	3.83	1197/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	2	2	2	8	9	19	4.03	1069/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	5	7	2	8	9	11	3.41	1093/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	2	13	18	18	3.61	1032/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	4	7	16	28	4.02	922/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	6	14	12	22	3.68	1118/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	12	3	10	9	22	3.46	743/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	7	A	17	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	5	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	3	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	4	13	20	18	3.70	1333/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	7	22	21	3.83	1262/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	8	9	19	20	3.76	1162/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	2	3	9	16	13	3.81	1207/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	9	6	6	10	13	3.27	1308/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	3	2	5	8	11	3.76	1088/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	3	20	30	4.22	820/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	0	2	34	19	4.31	1239/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	1	13	23	11	3.86	1082/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	3	2	6	15	18	3.98	1220/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	3	3	5	13	21	4.02	1379/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	4	1	5	13	20	4.02	1072/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	4	6	8	17	3.84	1188/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	4	7	1	6	8	10	3.41	1093/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	2	13	18	18	3.61	1032/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	4	7	16	28	4.02	922/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	6	14	12	22	3.68	1118/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	12	3	10	9	22	3.46	743/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	7	A	17	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	5	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	3	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	4	13	20	18	3.70	1333/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	7	22	21	3.83	1262/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	8	9	19	20	3.76	1162/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	2	3	9	16	13	3.81	1207/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	9	6	6	10	13	3.27	1308/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	3	2	5	8	11	3.76	1088/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	3	20	30	4.22	820/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	0	0	2	34	19	4.31	1239/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	7	27	15	4.10	845/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	2	2	5	15	20	4.11	1169/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	4	1	4	11	25	4.16	1355/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	4	1	4	15	19	4.02	1072/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	2	6	9	19	4.08	1054/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	3	6	2	5	7	12	3.53	1049/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	2	13	18	18	3.61	1032/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	4	7	16	28	4.02	922/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.02
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	6	14	12	22	3.68	1118/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	12	3	10	9	22	3.46	743/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.46

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	60

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	7	A	17	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	5	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	3	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	7	16	13	18	3.59	1383/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	12	16	23	3.90	1230/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	5	11	18	19	3.80	1145/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	5	13	13	13	3.71	1274/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	6	3	13	15	14	3.55	1190/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	5	6	7	10	3.60	1167/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	3	14	15	21	3.91	1136/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	0	0	39	14	4.26	1276/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	1	3	8	22	11	3.87	1074/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	5	14	35	4.43	942/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	14	39	4.63	1090/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	10	13	29	4.16	991/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	8	16	27	4.26	922/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	1	12	12	27	4.07	690/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	5	10	17	19	3.71	982/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	6	14	32	4.33	758/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	4	12	17	15	3.53	1163/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	7	13	12	19	3.84	578/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.84

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	2 A 13	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 11	General	6	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	7	16	13	18	3.59	1383/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	12	16	23	3.90	1230/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	5	11	18	19	3.80	1145/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	5	13	13	13	3.71	1274/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	6	3	13	15	14	3.55	1190/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	5	6	7	10	3.60	1167/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	3	14	15	21	3.91	1136/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	0	0	39	14	4.26	1276/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	3	0	0	10	25	6	3.90	1046/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	0	5	10	20	4.33	1021/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	1	0	3	12	19	4.37	1273/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	2	2	8	11	11	3.79	1210/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	3	8	10	10	3.87	1172/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	3	4	0	12	8	10	3.59	1031/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	5	10	17	19	3.71	982/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	6	14	32	4.33	758/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	4	12	17	15	3.53	1163/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	7	13	12	19	3.84	578/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.84

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	2 A 13	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 11	General	6	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	7	16	13	18	3.59	1383/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	12	16	23	3.90	1230/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	5	11	18	19	3.80	1145/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	5	13	13	13	3.71	1274/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	6	3	13	15	14	3.55	1190/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	5	6	7	10	3.60	1167/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	3	14	15	21	3.91	1136/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	0	0	39	14	4.26	1276/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	3	3	15	14	4	3.33	1337/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	4	0	6	8	13	3.84	1287/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	5	2	4	9	15	3.77	1408/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	5	2	6	8	10	3.52	1298/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	3	9	7	10	3.56	1285/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	5	2	10	6	9	3.38	1102/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	5	10	17	19	3.71	982/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	6	14	32	4.33	758/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	4	12	17	15	3.53	1163/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	7	13	12	19	3.84	578/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.84

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	2 A 13	Required for Majors	49
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 23		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 11	General	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	7	16	13	18	3.59	1383/1528	3.85	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	12	16	23	3.90	1230/1527	3.96	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	5	11	18	19	3.80	1145/1333	3.93	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	5	13	13	13	3.71	1274/1495	3.72	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	6	3	13	15	14	3.55	1190/1439	3.60	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	25	2	5	6	7	10	3.60	1167/1425	3.63	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	3	14	15	21	3.91	1136/1508	4.09	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	0	0	39	14	4.26	1276/1526	4.36	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	5	0	0	10	20	8	3.95	992/1490	3.77	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	1	0	5	12	13	4.16	1138/1428	4.36	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	1	2	2	12	17	4.24	1329/1436	4.41	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	1	2	6	12	11	3.94	1136/1427	4.11	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	3	9	7	12	3.90	1157/1425	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	3	4	1	11	6	11	3.58	1035/1291	3.85	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	5	10	17	19	3.71	982/1271	3.63	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	6	14	32	4.33	758/1276	3.94	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	4	12	17	15	3.53	1163/1273	3.66	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	7	13	12	19	3.84	578/922	3.72	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.84

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	58

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	6	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 04
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1433/1528	3.90	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	1434/1527	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1333	****	3.90	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1047/1495	4.33	3.88	4.25	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1418/1425	2.00	3.80	4.12	3.93	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1397/1508	3.10	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1269/1490	3.88	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1428	****	4.31	4.49	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1436	****	4.44	4.74	4.70	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1427	****	4.06	4.32	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1425	****	4.02	4.34	4.31	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1291	****	3.78	4.05	3.97	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	54/76	4.47	3.48	4.51	4.44	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	70/74	3.60	3.26	4.31	4.43	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	58/66	4.13	3.57	4.27	4.15	3.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	53/76	4.48	2.99	4.27	4.21	4.17
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	66/73	2.95	2.95	3.94	3.82	2.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 04
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 08
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	3	2	4.40	765/1528	3.90	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	952/1527	3.77	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	****	3.90	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	313/1495	4.33	3.88	4.25	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1439	****	3.80	4.11	3.97	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1425	2.00	3.80	4.12	3.93	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1422/1508	3.10	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	675/1490	3.88	3.80	4.11	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	3.87	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	38/76	4.47	3.48	4.51	4.44	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	47/74	3.60	3.26	4.31	4.43	4.20
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	24/66	4.13	3.57	4.27	4.15	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/76	4.48	2.99	4.27	4.21	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	57/73	2.95	2.95	3.94	3.82	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 08	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	8
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors			Questionnaires:	6
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F				

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	7	5	9	3.54	1398/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	12	6	3.85	1257/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	12	5	3.73	1175/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	6	6	3	3.37	1403/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	12	8	4.08	807/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	826/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	12	8	3.96	1084/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	853/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	6	11	1	3.63	1221/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	11	6	3.92	1256/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	5	9	9	4.04	1377/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	3	12	5	3.63	1273/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	8	8	6	3.75	1226/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	2	2	7	7	3.75	937/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	5	8	3	3.23	1163/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	4	8	8	3.91	994/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	1	5	10	2	3.23	1218/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	2	2	8	6	3.70	638/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	7	5	9	3.54	1398/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	12	6	3.85	1257/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	12	5	3.73	1175/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	6	6	3	3.37	1403/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	12	8	4.08	807/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	826/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	12	8	3.96	1084/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	853/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	2	4	8	1	3.53	1260/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1186/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1043/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	6	6	1	3.33	1339/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	2	6	4	3.60	1273/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	728/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	5	8	3	3.23	1163/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	4	8	8	3.91	994/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	1	5	10	2	3.23	1218/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	2	2	8	6	3.70	638/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	7	5	9	3.54	1398/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	12	6	3.85	1257/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	12	5	3.73	1175/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	6	6	3	3.37	1403/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	12	8	4.08	807/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	826/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	12	8	3.96	1084/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	853/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	1	5	7	0	3.13	1389/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1244/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	1340/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	2	2	9	2	3.73	1234/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1246/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	2	0	0	5	5	3.92	825/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	5	8	3	3.23	1163/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	4	8	8	3.91	994/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	1	5	10	2	3.23	1218/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	2	2	8	6	3.70	638/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 42
Title: Prin Of Chemistry II		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor: Hamilton,Diana		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	8	11	16	3.95	1195/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	20	13	4.08	1064/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	21	9	3.90	1092/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	2	3	13	6	3.73	1260/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	2	7	11	13	3.81	1020/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	20	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1121/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	13	18	4.26	771/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	36	4.89	583/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	1	0	4	16	6	3.96	965/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	11	26	4.66	653/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	32	4.84	709/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	13	22	4.54	577/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	14	20	4.42	785/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	3	4	9	17	4.21	567/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	8	9	10	3.58	1049/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	2	3	7	17	3.94	973/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	3	2	13	9	3.73	1092/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	6	6	4	10	3.59	693/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	32
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 8	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 10		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	8	11	16	3.95	1195/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	20	13	4.08	1064/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	21	9	3.90	1092/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	2	3	13	6	3.73	1260/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	2	7	11	13	3.81	1020/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	20	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1121/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	13	18	4.26	771/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	36	4.89	583/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	2	5	12	8	0	2.96	1416/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	8	16	10	3.82	1294/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	8	28	4.66	1055/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	6	5	11	12	3	3.03	1377/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	10	9	10	3.42	1322/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	7	3	7	14	3.73	958/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	8	9	10	3.58	1049/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	2	3	7	17	3.94	973/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	3	2	13	9	3.73	1092/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	6	6	4	10	3.59	693/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	32
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 8	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 10		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	8	11	16	3.95	1195/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	20	13	4.08	1064/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	21	9	3.90	1092/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	2	3	13	6	3.73	1260/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	2	7	11	13	3.81	1020/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	20	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1121/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	13	18	4.26	771/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	36	4.89	583/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	2	10	12	2	3.36	1330/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	3	12	20	4.26	1072/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	6	7	24	4.49	1198/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	6	7	11	10	3.66	1263/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	2	6	9	12	3.54	1292/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	3	2	4	8	10	3.74	944/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	8	9	10	3.58	1049/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	2	3	7	17	3.94	973/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	3	2	13	9	3.73	1092/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	6	6	4	10	3.59	693/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	38
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	20	13	3.80	1285/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	11	16	20	4.08	1057/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	3	7	16	18	3.85	1116/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	5	6	9	11	3.75	1247/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	5	9	9	16	3.78	1037/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	26	5	3	3	4	7	3.23	1312/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	7	10	26	4.15	921/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	41	4.79	755/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	1	0	7	15	12	4.06	878/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	13	31	4.54	806/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	12	33	4.58	1127/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	8	8	28	4.25	916/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	7	11	25	4.17	997/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	5	6	11	22	4.07	695/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	4	13	9	11	3.46	1092/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	3	4	7	25	4.22	830/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	6	10	10	13	3.63	1134/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	4	7	7	7	13	3.47	737/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	38 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 16		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5 C 14	General	4 Under-grad 49 Non-major 47
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 7		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	20	13	3.80	1285/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	11	16	20	4.08	1057/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	3	7	16	18	3.85	1116/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	5	6	9	11	3.75	1247/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	5	9	9	16	3.78	1037/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	26	5	3	3	4	7	3.23	1312/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	7	10	26	4.15	921/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	41	4.79	755/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	2	2	16	12	2	3.29	1350/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	6	8	10	20	4.00	1202/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	10	30	4.60	1114/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	8	13	9	11	3.44	1317/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	8	13	14	3.63	1267/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	2	1	5	16	16	4.08	690/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	4	13	9	11	3.46	1092/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	3	4	7	25	4.22	830/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	6	10	10	13	3.63	1134/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	4	7	7	7	13	3.47	737/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	38 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 16		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5 C 14	General	4 Under-grad 49 Non-major 47
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 7		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	20	13	3.80	1285/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	11	16	20	4.08	1057/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	3	7	16	18	3.85	1116/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	5	6	9	11	3.75	1247/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	5	9	9	16	3.78	1037/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	26	5	3	3	4	7	3.23	1312/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	7	10	26	4.15	921/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	41	4.79	755/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	1	2	16	12	3	3.41	1308/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	2	3	10	23	4.25	1079/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	2	1	2	5	28	4.47	1206/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	7	7	11	13	3.72	1242/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	4	11	8	10	3.43	1320/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	3	2	10	8	13	3.72	958/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	4	13	9	11	3.46	1092/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	3	4	7	25	4.22	830/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	6	10	10	13	3.63	1134/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	4	7	7	7	13	3.47	737/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	38 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 16		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5 C 14	General	4 Under-grad 49 Non-major 47
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 7		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	12	14	3.79	1290/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	7	11	17	3.90	1225/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	12	11	10	3.55	1229/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	4	6	6	5	5	3.04	1450/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	3	6	5	8	10	3.50	1216/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1333/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7	10	5	16	3.65	1274/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	2	0	1	12	22	4.41	1163/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	3	10	11	3	3.52	1266/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	2	6	11	12	4.06	1186/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	4	9	17	4.35	1282/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	2	7	11	10	3.87	1174/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	4	10	7	10	3.74	1229/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	2	2	9	5	9	3.63	1013/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	3	11	9	10	3.56	1057/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	4	12	18	4.28	792/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	8	11	12	3.83	1050/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	2	9	2	15	3.77	608/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.77

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	3	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	12	14	3.79	1290/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	7	11	17	3.90	1225/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	12	11	10	3.55	1229/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	4	6	6	5	5	3.04	1450/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	3	6	5	8	10	3.50	1216/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1333/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7	10	5	16	3.65	1274/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	2	0	1	12	22	4.41	1163/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	2	4	10	11	0	3.11	1393/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	4	10	6	10	3.73	1319/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	2	2	9	17	4.37	1277/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	4	5	6	9	6	3.27	1348/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	4	10	5	8	3.37	1333/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	3	1	6	5	11	3.77	930/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	3	11	9	10	3.56	1057/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	4	12	18	4.28	792/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	8	11	12	3.83	1050/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	2	9	2	15	3.77	608/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.77

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	3	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	10	12	14	3.79	1290/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	7	11	17	3.90	1225/1527	3.98	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	12	11	10	3.55	1229/1333	3.76	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	4	6	6	5	5	3.04	1450/1495	3.47	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	3	6	5	8	10	3.50	1216/1439	3.79	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	23	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1333/1425	3.54	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7	10	5	16	3.65	1274/1508	4.00	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	2	0	1	12	22	4.41	1163/1526	4.70	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	1	13	12	2	3.54	1260/1490	3.46	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	4	4	13	12	4.00	1202/1428	4.10	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	4	9	20	4.48	1198/1436	4.48	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	1	11	10	9	3.70	1249/1427	3.68	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	2	3	12	6	9	3.53	1295/1425	3.69	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	2	7	10	8	3.79	916/1291	3.87	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	3	11	9	10	3.56	1057/1271	3.46	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	4	12	18	4.28	792/1276	4.09	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	8	11	12	3.83	1050/1273	3.61	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	2	9	2	15	3.77	608/922	3.64	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.77

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0 A 8	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1 B 14	General	3	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2 C 14						
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6 D 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0						
			P 0						
			I 0						
			? 3	Other	1				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	9	2	3.69	1341/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	1191/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	934/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	9	3	3.93	1125/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	5	3	3	3.21	1326/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1157/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	3	5	3.47	1329/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	5	4	0	3.09	1397/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1352/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	1236/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	6	3	4	3.38	1333/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	1132/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	814/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	733/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1007/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1229/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	316/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	125/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	170/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	137/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	123/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	134/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	9	2	3.69	1341/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	1191/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	934/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	9	3	3.93	1125/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	5	3	3	3.21	1326/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1157/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	3	5	3.47	1329/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1067/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1138/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	1322/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1024/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	1076/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	733/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1007/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1229/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	316/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	125/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	170/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	137/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	123/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	134/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tran,Thao

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	9	2	3.69	1341/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	1191/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	934/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	9	3	3.93	1125/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	5	3	3	3.21	1326/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1157/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	3	5	3.47	1329/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	911/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	920/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	886/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	565/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	951/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	574/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	733/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1007/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1229/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	316/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tran,Thao

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	125/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	170/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	137/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	123/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	134/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	6	5	6	3.57	1386/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	9	3	3.43	1421/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1263/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	5	9	2	3.53	1359/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	10	5	3.75	1064/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	858/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	7	5	1	2.80	1462/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	566/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	1	7	3	1	3.33	1337/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	10	4	3.94	1238/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	1066/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	6	6	3	3.53	1296/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1226/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	614/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	780/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1035/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1186/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	719/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	174/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	119/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	156/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	156/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	148/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.70
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	6	5	6	3.57	1386/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	9	3	3.43	1421/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1263/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	5	9	2	3.53	1359/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	10	5	3.75	1064/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	858/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	7	5	1	2.80	1462/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	566/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	864/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1294/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1155/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1080/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	815/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	634/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	780/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1035/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1186/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	719/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	174/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	119/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	156/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	156/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	148/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.70
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	24
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode,Tijesun

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	6	5	6	3.57	1386/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	9	3	3.43	1421/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1263/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	5	9	2	3.53	1359/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	10	5	3.75	1064/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	858/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	7	5	1	2.80	1462/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	566/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	3	3	3	4	1	2.79	1447/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	5	2	5	1	3.15	1395/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	3	2	6	2	3.54	1419/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	5	4	1	3.33	1339/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	7	2	3.58	1279/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1061/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	780/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1035/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1186/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	719/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode, Tijesun

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	174/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	119/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	156/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	156/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	148/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.70
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 24
Title: Intro Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Odebode, Tijesun		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	1	3	5	5	3.33	1447/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1472/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	5	3	7	3.67	1198/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	1	6	3	4	3.24	1431/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1216/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	0	4	5	3	3.33	1285/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	1	5	3	4	3.12	1410/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1239/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1352/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	4	2	9	3.94	1391/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	4	4	3	3.12	1367/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	1	6	4	3.29	1344/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	1	3	7	3.73	951/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	365/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	837/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	3	0	4	2	2	3.00	188/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	185/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	2	0	2	6	3.91	179/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	3.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	4	0	1	2	4	3.18	186/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	159/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	1	3	5	5	3.33	1447/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1472/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	5	3	7	3.67	1198/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	1	6	3	4	3.24	1431/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1216/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	0	4	5	3	3.33	1285/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	1	5	3	4	3.12	1410/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	434/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	1263/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	1314/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	1314/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	1273/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1153/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	365/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	837/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	3	0	4	2	2	3.00	188/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	185/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	2	0	2	6	3.91	179/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	3.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	4	0	1	2	4	3.18	186/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	159/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	1	3	5	5	3.33	1447/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1472/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	5	3	7	3.67	1198/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	1	6	3	4	3.24	1431/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1216/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	0	4	5	3	3.33	1285/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	1	5	3	4	3.12	1410/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	3	5	1	1	3.00	1406/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1358/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	1416/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	3	3	4	1	2.92	1387/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	2	1	4	4	0	2.91	1384/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1194/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	365/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	837/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	3	0	4	2	2	3.00	188/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	185/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	2	0	2	6	3.91	179/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	3.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	4	0	1	2	4	3.18	186/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	159/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	6	8	3.74	1317/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	6	8	3.78	1290/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	7	10	3.96	1045/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	1	7	8	3.90	1159/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	851/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	3	6	7	3.70	1121/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	9	9	2	3.43	1345/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1132/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	10	6	2	3.35	1330/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	2	7	10	4.05	1191/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	1183/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	7	6	3.68	1252/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	8	5	6	3.55	1292/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	5	4	8	3.75	937/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	0	1	2	3	3.00	1195/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1128/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	1	1	2	2	2.70	1252/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	2.70
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	3	1	4	4	9	3.71	165/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	133/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	30/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	80/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	71/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A 7	Required for Majors	19
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 11	Graduate	0
				Major	1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General			0	Under-grad	23	Non-major		22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	3									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	6	8	3.74	1317/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	6	8	3.78	1290/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	7	10	3.96	1045/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	1	7	8	3.90	1159/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	851/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	3	6	7	3.70	1121/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	9	9	2	3.43	1345/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1132/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	4	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1167/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1202/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1244/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1183/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1282/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	614/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	0	1	2	3	3.00	1195/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1128/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	1	1	2	2	2.70	1252/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	2.70
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	3	1	4	4	9	3.71	165/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	133/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	30/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	80/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	71/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11
				Required for Majors	19
				Graduate	0
				Major	1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 06	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 23
Title: Intro Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Gierasch, Tiffan		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General			0	Under-grad	23	Non-major		22	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0										
				I	0	Other			0						
				?	3										

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Woody,Caitlin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	6	8	3.74	1317/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	6	8	3.78	1290/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	7	10	3.96	1045/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	1	7	8	3.90	1159/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	851/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	3	6	7	3.70	1121/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	9	9	2	3.43	1345/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1132/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	675/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	981/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	1355/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	843/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	1076/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	518/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	0	1	2	3	3.00	1195/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1128/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	1	1	2	2	2.70	1252/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	2.70
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Woody,Caitlin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	3	1	4	4	9	3.71	165/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	133/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	30/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	80/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	71/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11
				Required for Majors	19
				Graduate	0
				Major	1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Woody,Caitlin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General			0	Under-grad	23	Non-major		22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	3									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	7	8	4.21	962/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	795/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	9	3.95	1045/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	867/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	818/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	6	3	5	3.80	1056/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	1	12	4.15	908/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1201/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	9	2	3.81	1110/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	794/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	580/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1218/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1219/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	539/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	6	6	7	4.05	131/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.05
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	85/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	32/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	60/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	55/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.53
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General			1	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 responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			1					
				?	3									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	7	8	4.21	962/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	795/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	9	3.95	1045/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	867/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	818/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	6	3	5	3.80	1056/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	1	12	4.15	908/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1201/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1136/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	6	6	7	4.05	131/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.05
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	85/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	32/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	60/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	55/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.53
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General			1	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 responses to be significant					
				P	0										
				I	0	Other			1						
				?	3										

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	7	8	4.21	962/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	795/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	9	3.95	1045/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	867/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	818/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	6	3	5	3.80	1056/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	1	12	4.15	908/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1201/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	579/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	6	6	7	4.05	131/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.05
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	85/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	32/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	60/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	55/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.53
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning, Ben

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General			1	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 responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			1					
				?	3									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	0	7	7	4.13	1057/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1113/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	564/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	721/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	573/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	553/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	7	2	5	3.56	1302/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	900/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1096/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	854/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	806/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1024/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	1021/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	1	1	6	5	3.73	951/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	701/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1205/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1046/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	164/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	135/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	156/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	173/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	153/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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 responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	1	0	7	7	4.13	1057/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1113/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	564/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	721/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	573/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	553/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	7	2	5	3.56	1302/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	900/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	911/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	637/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	886/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	772/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	755/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1132/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	701/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1205/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1046/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	164/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	135/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	156/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	173/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	153/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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 responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	0	7	7	4.13	1057/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1113/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	564/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	721/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	573/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	553/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	7	2	5	3.56	1302/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	900/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	5	3	0	3.00	1406/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1114/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1352/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1246/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1076/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1061/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	701/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1205/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1046/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	164/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	135/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	156/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	173/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	153/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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 responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	9	3	3.72	1322/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	1	3.78	1296/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1098/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1114/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1232/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	992/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	5	5	3	3.50	1317/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	881/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	3	8	2	1	2.93	1423/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	10	5	2	3.53	1360/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	1329/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	5	6	2	3.29	1345/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	4	7	2	3.24	1352/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	2	5	2	3	3.14	1175/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	669/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	750/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	857/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	91/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	123/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	114/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	121/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	78/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	9	3	3.72	1322/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	1	3.78	1296/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1098/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1114/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1232/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	992/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	5	5	3	3.50	1317/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	881/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	2	3	0	3	3.50	1269/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1280/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1382/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1080/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1183/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1061/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	669/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	750/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	857/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	91/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	123/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	114/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	121/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	78/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Brown,Tim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	9	3	3.72	1322/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	1	3.78	1296/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1098/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1114/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1232/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	992/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	5	5	3	3.50	1317/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	881/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	675/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1021/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1183/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	420/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	277/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	669/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	750/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	857/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Brown, Tim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	91/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	123/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	114/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	121/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	78/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Brown, Tim

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 5		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	1341/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	1366/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	5	5	3.56	1226/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	6	5	1	3.36	1406/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1153/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1101/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	3	0	3	2.38	1488/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	2.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	900/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1203/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	1	4	7	3.93	1244/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1340/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1178/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	1	6	3.71	1239/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	882/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	598/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1026/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	947/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	272/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	185/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	189/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	104/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	177/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	169/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	1341/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	1366/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	5	5	3.56	1226/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	6	5	1	3.36	1406/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1153/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1101/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	3	0	3	2.38	1488/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	2.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	900/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1118/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1079/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1090/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	625/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	838/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	937/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	598/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1026/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	947/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	272/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	185/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	189/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	104/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	177/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	169/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode,Tijesun

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	1341/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	1366/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	5	5	3.56	1226/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	6	5	1	3.36	1406/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1153/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1101/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	3	0	3	2.38	1488/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	2.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	900/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	6	2	0	2.90	1431/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1169/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	1332/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1169/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	1029/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1061/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	598/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1026/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	947/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	272/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode, Tijesun

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	185/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	189/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	104/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	177/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	169/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	5	3.88	1242/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	922/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1162/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	3	3	6	3.80	1213/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1064/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1231/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1199/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	618/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	911/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	1132/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	1307/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	1032/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	1203/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	6	2	5	3.71	965/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	988/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	890/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1073/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	833/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	58/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	157/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	58/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	45/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	42/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	5	3.88	1242/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	922/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1162/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	3	3	6	3.80	1213/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1064/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1231/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1199/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	618/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	911/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1178/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	1322/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1160/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	1292/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1093/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	988/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	890/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1073/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	833/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	58/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	157/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	58/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	45/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	42/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	5	3.88	1242/1528	3.77	3.97	4.31	4.16	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	922/1527	3.80	3.96	4.28	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1162/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.26	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	3	3	6	3.80	1213/1495	3.81	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1064/1439	3.74	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1231/1425	3.77	3.80	4.12	3.93	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1199/1508	3.36	3.88	4.18	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	618/1526	4.73	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	142/1490	3.71	3.80	4.11	4.02	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	818/1428	4.05	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1102/1436	4.35	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	683/1427	3.88	4.06	4.32	4.27	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	1005/1425	3.87	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	923/1291	3.72	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	988/1271	4.02	3.73	4.16	3.98	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	890/1276	3.88	3.87	4.33	4.14	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1073/1273	3.58	3.65	4.38	4.18	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	833/922	3.85	3.67	4.02	3.87	3.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	58/198	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	157/208	4.07	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	58/194	4.53	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	45/194	4.12	4.31	4.37	4.30	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	42/176	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.19	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2 A 3	Required for Majors	12 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1 B 7	General	1 Under-grad 17 Non-major 16
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 5		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3 D 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 123 1
Title:	Gen Organic & Biochem I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	96
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	11	7	4.04	1115/1528	4.04	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	7	8	3.79	1284/1527	3.79	3.96	4.28	4.23	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	6	10	4.04	982/1333	4.04	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	7	3	5	3.87	1180/1495	3.87	3.88	4.25	4.11	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	10	5	3.90	963/1439	3.90	3.80	4.11	3.97	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	839/1425	4.08	3.80	4.12	3.93	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	734/1508	4.29	3.88	4.18	4.11	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	15	8	4.29	1248/1526	4.29	4.61	4.66	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	7	9	3	3.41	1313/1490	3.41	3.80	4.11	4.02	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	1021/1428	4.33	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	4	3	14	4.17	1352/1436	4.17	4.44	4.74	4.70	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	8	7	3.71	1246/1427	3.71	4.06	4.32	4.27	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	9	8	3.92	1148/1425	3.92	4.02	4.34	4.31	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	4	8	6	3.81	902/1291	3.81	3.78	4.05	3.97	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	780/1271	4.00	3.73	4.16	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1062/1276	3.75	3.87	4.33	4.14	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 123 1
Title:	Gen Organic & Biochem I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	96
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.23	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	3.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 7		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 8	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 1		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	3	4	7	3.43	1428/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	1	10	4	3.52	1401/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	4	5	6	4	3.40	1268/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	1	7	6	3.82	1202/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1090/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1048/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1018/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	1	3	10	0	3.18	1381/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1191/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	1206/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	8	2	7	3.43	1323/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	0	4	9	3.52	1298/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	4	0	2	2	7	3.53	1049/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1184/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	926/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	121/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	97/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	49/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	100/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0	Major 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	30
Title:	Analytical Chemistry		Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	2		1.00-1.99	0	B	6								
56-83	5		2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major		17
84-150	8		3.00-3.49	3	D	1								
Grad.	0		3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
					P	0								
					I	0	Other		0					
					?	2								

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	3	4	7	3.43	1428/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	1	10	4	3.52	1401/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	4	5	6	4	3.40	1268/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	1	7	6	3.82	1202/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1090/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1048/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1018/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	11	1	3.76	1142/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	686/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	1229/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	863/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	1057/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	728/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1184/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	926/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	121/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	97/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	49/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	100/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0	Major 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6									
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major			17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	1									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	2									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	3	4	7	3.43	1428/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	1	10	4	3.52	1401/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	4	5	6	4	3.40	1268/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	1	7	6	3.82	1202/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1090/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1048/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1018/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	822/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	953/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1340/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	812/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	981/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1184/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	926/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	121/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	97/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	49/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	100/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0	Major 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	30
Title:	Analytical Chemistry		Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6									
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General		0	Under-grad	22		Non-major		17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	1									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	2									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	3	4	7	3.43	1428/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	1	10	4	3.52	1401/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	4	5	6	4	3.40	1268/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	1	1	7	6	3.82	1202/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1090/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1048/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1018/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	11	3	4.06	871/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	818/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1340/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	899/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1048/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1184/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	926/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	121/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	97/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	49/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	100/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0	Major 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6									
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major			17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	1									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	2									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	16	10	4.20	973/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	20	4	3.93	1191/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	17	9	4.17	898/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	832/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	13	10	4.00	851/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	852/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	9	9	11	4.07	1003/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	15	7	4.12	833/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	5	19	4.48	876/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	645/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	9	11	7	3.73	1234/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	11	14	4.31	886/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	1	1	9	10	4.04	706/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	6	12	9	4.04	133/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.04
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	3	2	6	17	4.32	110/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.32
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	32/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	40/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	7	16	4.32	90/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.32
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	26 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 30 Non-major 27
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	16	10	4.20	973/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	20	4	3.93	1191/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	17	9	4.17	898/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	832/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	13	10	4.00	851/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	852/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	9	9	11	4.07	1003/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	14	8	4.20	734/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	553/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	1078/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	601/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	886/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	10	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	654/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	6	12	9	4.04	133/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.04
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	3	2	6	17	4.32	110/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.32
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	32/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	40/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	7	16	4.32	90/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.32
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	26 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 30 Non-major 27
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	16	10	4.20	973/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	20	4	3.93	1191/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	17	9	4.17	898/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	832/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	13	10	4.00	851/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	852/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	9	9	11	4.07	1003/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	14	5	4.00	911/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	588/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1183/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	792/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	870/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	8	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	6	12	9	4.04	133/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.04
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	3	2	6	17	4.32	110/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.32
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	32/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	40/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	7	16	4.32	90/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.32
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	26 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 30 Non-major 27
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	16	10	4.20	973/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	20	4	3.93	1191/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	17	9	4.17	898/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	832/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	13	10	4.00	851/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	852/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	9	9	11	4.07	1003/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	12	8	4.17	778/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	637/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	1268/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	683/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	930/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	7	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	6	12	9	4.04	133/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.04
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	3	2	6	17	4.32	110/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.32
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	32/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	40/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	7	16	4.32	90/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.32
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	26 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 30 Non-major 27
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	865/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	12	4.30	853/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	925/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	7	4	6	3.68	1291/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	541/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	3	0	6	5	3.93	959/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	586/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	283/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	2	8	5	3.88	1060/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	942/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	1043/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	4	10	3.95	1120/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	1048/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	728/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	72/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	47/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	68/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	93/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	75/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	865/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	12	4.30	853/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	925/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	7	4	6	3.68	1291/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	541/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	3	0	6	5	3.93	959/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	586/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	283/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	1	10	4	4.00	911/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	965/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	1346/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	863/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	3	10	4.19	981/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	72/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	47/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	68/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	93/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	75/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	865/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	12	4.30	853/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	925/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	7	4	6	3.68	1291/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	541/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	3	0	6	5	3.93	959/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	586/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	283/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	344/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	770/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	996/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	565/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	1037/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	72/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	47/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	68/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	93/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	75/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	865/1528	3.98	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	12	4.30	853/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	925/1333	3.90	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	7	4	6	3.68	1291/1495	3.92	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	541/1439	4.03	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	3	0	6	5	3.93	959/1425	3.94	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	586/1508	4.18	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	283/1526	4.98	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	756/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	770/1428	4.51	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	1260/1436	4.47	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	565/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	1037/1425	4.13	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1291	3.94	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1271	3.13	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1276	4.00	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	72/198	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	47/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	68/194	4.89	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	93/194	4.64	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	75/176	4.32	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 301 1
Title:	Physical Chemistry I
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	116
Questionnaires:	61

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	15	12	16	14	3	2.63	1513/1528	2.63	3.97	4.31	4.34	2.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	21	14	15	4	2.83	1501/1527	2.83	3.96	4.28	4.27	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	12	15	16	11	3.23	1290/1333	3.23	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	42	2	5	5	4	2	2.94	1463/1495	2.94	3.88	4.25	4.28	2.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	3	9	10	13	15	3.56	1178/1439	3.56	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	42	3	4	7	1	2	2.71	1393/1425	2.71	3.80	4.12	4.17	2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	9	15	18	13	3.42	1353/1508	3.42	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	6	43	9	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	18	15	17	3	1	2.15	1483/1490	2.15	3.80	4.11	4.11	2.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	17	13	22	5	3	2.40	1422/1428	2.40	4.31	4.49	4.48	2.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	5	15	28	11	3.72	1412/1436	3.72	4.44	4.74	4.74	3.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	22	12	18	6	2	2.23	1415/1427	2.23	4.06	4.32	4.31	2.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	26	10	10	12	2	2.23	1413/1425	2.23	4.02	4.34	4.34	2.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	13	9	14	5	1	2.33	1269/1291	2.33	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	54	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	54	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	54	2	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 301 1
Title:	Physical Chemistry I
Instructor:	Kelly, Lisa A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	116
Questionnaires:	61

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	61	Non-major	44
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L O2
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	4	21	4.70	376/1528	4.35	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	8	7	3.74	1314/1527	3.66	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	4.33	3.90	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	7	14	4.27	832/1495	4.35	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	8	9	7	3.81	1020/1439	3.90	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	329/1425	4.50	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	6	2	6	10	3.72	1246/1508	3.86	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	1019/1526	4.71	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	5	13	2	3.71	1173/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	854/1428	4.80	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	2	21	4.58	1134/1436	4.66	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	7	12	4.12	1032/1427	4.31	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	11	10	4.04	1066/1425	4.33	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	4	5	12	4.13	644/1291	4.68	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1271	5.00	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1276	4.33	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	75/198	4.14	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L O2
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	4	14	7	3.96	162/208	3.90	4.29	4.27	4.31	3.96
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	133/194	4.57	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.48
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	4	5	15	4.27	137/194	4.23	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	9	8	10	4.04	123/176	3.69	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.04
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L O2
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	4	21	4.70	376/1528	4.35	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	8	7	3.74	1314/1527	3.66	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	4.33	3.90	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	7	14	4.27	832/1495	4.35	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	8	9	7	3.81	1020/1439	3.90	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	329/1425	4.50	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	6	2	6	10	3.72	1246/1508	3.86	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	1019/1526	4.71	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	3	13	2	3.94	992/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1428	4.80	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	1148/1436	4.66	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1427	4.31	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1425	4.33	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	4.68	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1271	5.00	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1276	4.33	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	75/198	4.14	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L O2
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	4	14	7	3.96	162/208	3.90	4.29	4.27	4.31	3.96
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	133/194	4.57	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.48
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	4	5	15	4.27	137/194	4.23	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	9	8	10	4.04	123/176	3.69	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.04
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L O2
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Manning,Steven

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	4	21	4.70	376/1528	4.35	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	8	7	3.74	1314/1527	3.66	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	4.33	3.90	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	7	14	4.27	832/1495	4.35	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	8	9	7	3.81	1020/1439	3.90	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	329/1425	4.50	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	6	2	6	10	3.72	1246/1508	3.86	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	1019/1526	4.71	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1096/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1428	4.80	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1043/1436	4.66	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1427	4.31	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1425	4.33	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	4.68	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1271	5.00	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1276	4.33	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	75/198	4.14	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Manning,Steven

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	4	14	7	3.96	162/208	3.90	4.29	4.27	4.31	3.96
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	133/194	4.57	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.48
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	4	5	15	4.27	137/194	4.23	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	9	8	10	4.04	123/176	3.69	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.04
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1140/1528	4.35	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1383/1527	3.66	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	769/1333	4.33	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	624/1495	4.35	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	851/1439	3.90	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1425	4.50	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1050/1508	3.86	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	654/1526	4.71	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1304/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	553/1428	4.80	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	677/1436	4.66	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1008/1427	4.31	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	908/1425	4.33	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	253/1291	4.68	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	3.73	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	750/1276	4.33	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	153/198	4.14	4.11	4.16	4.26	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	177/208	3.90	4.29	4.27	4.31	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	104/194	4.57	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	143/194	4.23	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	164/176	3.69	4.12	4.23	4.33	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1140/1528	4.35	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1383/1527	3.66	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	769/1333	4.33	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	624/1495	4.35	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	851/1439	3.90	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1425	4.50	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1050/1508	3.86	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	654/1526	4.71	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1118/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1428	4.80	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1043/1436	4.66	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	625/1427	4.31	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	667/1425	4.33	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1291	4.68	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	3.73	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	750/1276	4.33	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	153/198	4.14	4.11	4.16	4.26	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	177/208	3.90	4.29	4.27	4.31	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	104/194	4.57	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	143/194	4.23	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	164/176	3.69	4.12	4.23	4.33	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Manning,Steven

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1140/1528	4.35	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1383/1527	3.66	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	769/1333	4.33	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	624/1495	4.35	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	851/1439	3.90	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1425	4.50	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1050/1508	3.86	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	654/1526	4.71	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1313/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1428	4.80	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1043/1436	4.66	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	625/1427	4.31	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	667/1425	4.33	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1291	4.68	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	3.73	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	750/1276	4.33	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	153/198	4.14	4.11	4.16	4.26	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Manning,Steven

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	177/208	3.90	4.29	4.27	4.31	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	104/194	4.57	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	143/194	4.23	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	164/176	3.69	4.12	4.23	4.33	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	186
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	26	4.04	1115/1528	4.31	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	8	9	18	11	3.58	1380/1527	4.07	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	2	11	14	17	3.85	1116/1333	4.18	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	36	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	****/1495	4.21	3.88	4.25	4.28	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	3	5	9	20	4.16	753/1439	4.31	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	39	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	****/1425	4.32	3.80	4.12	4.17	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	6	10	9	20	3.83	1192/1508	4.12	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	21	25	4.54	1027/1526	4.58	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	9	6	13	14	1	2.81	1443/1490	3.63	3.80	4.11	4.11	2.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	5	11	13	16	3.77	1310/1428	4.18	4.31	4.49	4.48	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	3	12	30	4.47	1213/1436	4.65	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	8	9	11	12	7	3.02	1377/1427	3.72	4.06	4.32	4.31	3.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	10	7	8	9	11	3.09	1367/1425	3.80	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	8	3	6	4	8	3.03	1191/1291	3.26	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	41	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	186
Questionnaires:	49

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 12 Required for Majors	Graduate	Major 2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 0	C 7 General	Under-grad	Non-major 47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 13	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 23	F 2 Electives		
			P 0		
			I 0 Other		
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 2
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Radtke,Katherin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	209
Questionnaires:	107

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	2	9	19	73	4.58	544/1528	4.31	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	7	29	67	4.56	514/1527	4.07	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	7	27	66	4.50	564/1333	4.18	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	51	3	2	8	8	32	4.21	903/1495	4.21	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	14	1	3	7	21	58	4.47	419/1439	4.31	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	58	1	2	3	14	24	4.32	603/1425	4.32	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	1	12	26	61	4.40	586/1508	4.12	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	2	36	64	4.61	978/1526	4.58	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	4	0	1	9	29	50	4.44	449/1490	3.63	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	9	22	72	4.59	758/1428	4.18	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	13	89	4.84	742/1436	4.65	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	12	28	61	4.41	757/1427	3.72	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	12	19	69	4.52	655/1425	3.80	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	33	7	6	22	11	21	3.49	1064/1291	3.26	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	3	2	5	5	3.80	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	92	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	91	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	90	9	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 2
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Radtke,Katherin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	209
Questionnaires:	107

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	104	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	104	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	104	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	105	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	105	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	105	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	106	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	106	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	31	Required for Majors	78	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	26	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	6	C	18	General	0	Under-grad	107	Non-major	106
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	13	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	32	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	24						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L O2
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	5	6	4.31	865/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	538/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1087/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	445/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	753/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	766/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	995/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	651/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	335/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	420/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	349/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1024/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	446/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	591/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	947/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L O2
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	72/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	57/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	86/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	2	2	0	3	3	3.30	183/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	3.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	98/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.27
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	18										
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires:	13										
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J													
		Frequencies	Instructor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect						
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Peters,Hannah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	5	6	4.31	865/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	538/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1087/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	445/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	753/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	766/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	995/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	4	2	4	1	3.18	1379/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1114/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1398/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	959/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1157/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1102/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	446/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	591/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	947/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Peters,Hannah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	72/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.45
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	57/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	86/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	2	2	0	3	3	3.30	183/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	3.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	98/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.27
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 18
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Peters,Hannah		
	Frequencies	Instructor
Questions	NR	NA
Self Paced	1	2
	3	4
	5	Mean
	Mean	Rank
	Mean	Mean
	Mean	Mean
	Mean	Mean
	Mean	Mean

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	307/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	575/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	797/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	496/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	459/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	367/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	946/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1011/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	845/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	368/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	297/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	197/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	480/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	27/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	45/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	24/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	26/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	17/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Graduate	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 6		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Non-major 15
			P 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 1		
			Other		0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tantravedi,Sari

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	307/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	575/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	797/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	496/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	459/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	367/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	946/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1011/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	122/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	199/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	349/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	327/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tantravedi,Sari

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	27/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	45/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	24/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	26/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	17/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Graduate	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 6		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	636/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	477/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	415/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	369/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	459/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	167/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	626/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	811/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	698/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	270/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	625/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	349/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	882/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	36/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	64/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	44/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	74/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	36/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gantert-Festin,

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	636/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	477/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	415/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	369/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	459/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	167/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	626/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	811/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1082/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	36/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gantert-Festin,

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	64/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	44/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	74/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	36/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	5	4.30	865/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	853/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	863/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1367/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	816/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	845/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	911/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	572/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	713/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	556/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	728/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1116/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1230/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1221/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	659/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	51/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	51/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	125/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	80/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	50/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	66/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	3.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/66	3.00	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	37/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	2.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	35/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	37/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	3.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	17/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Temburnikar,K.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	5	4.30	865/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	853/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	863/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1367/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	816/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	845/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1136/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1202/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1332/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1080/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1076/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	327/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1116/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1230/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1221/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	659/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Temburnikar,K.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	51/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	51/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	125/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	80/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	50/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	66/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	3.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/66	3.00	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	37/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	2.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	35/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	37/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	3.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	17/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Temburnikar, K.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	13	4.61	506/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	760/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	977/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	844/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	406/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	816/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1101/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	881/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	530/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	794/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	742/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	792/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	915/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	728/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	55/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	87/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	72/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.76
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	87/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	116/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.12

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Grow, Margaret

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	13	4.61	506/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	760/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	977/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	844/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	406/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	816/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1101/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	881/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	734/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	637/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	1322/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	698/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1048/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Grow, Margaret

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	55/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	87/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	72/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.76
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	87/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	116/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.12

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Graduate	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Major 2
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1057/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1025/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1116/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	903/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	0	8	4	3.80	1020/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1197/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1199/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	839/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	698/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	669/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	1114/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	625/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	502/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1175/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	150/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	68/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	114/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	93/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	47/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Wauchope,Orrett

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1057/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1025/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1116/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	903/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	0	8	4	3.80	1020/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1197/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1199/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	839/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	579/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1065/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1398/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	577/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	1236/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	150/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Wauchope,Orrett

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	68/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	114/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	93/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	47/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P	0						
			I	0	Other	0				
			?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	492/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	501/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	1003/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	7	7	4.19	922/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	530/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	367/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1231/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	958/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	800/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	702/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	727/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	600/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	5	1	1	1	2.40	1264/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1148/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1218/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1229/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	81/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	68/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	123/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	2	0	0	5	7	4.07	152/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	68/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	3.00	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ginevan,Brandon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	492/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	501/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	1003/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	7	7	4.19	922/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	530/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	367/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1231/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	958/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1185/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1202/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1394/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1192/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	846/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1148/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1218/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1229/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ginevan,Brandon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	81/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	68/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	123/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	2	0	0	5	7	4.07	152/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	68/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	3.00	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ginevan,Brandon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1214/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1202/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1087/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1186/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1037/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1148/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	3.43	1349/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1002/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	911/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	1107/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	980/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1242/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1076/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1233/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	934/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	926/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1059/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	58/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	26/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	19/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	118/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.10

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Grow,Margaret

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1214/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1202/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1087/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1186/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1037/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1148/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	3.43	1349/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1002/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	789/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	794/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1183/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1032/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	1076/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	934/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	926/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1059/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Grow, Margaret

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	58/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	26/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	19/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	118/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.10

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1015/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	902/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1231/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	942/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	727/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1075/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	870/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1027/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	822/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	686/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	964/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	899/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1048/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	1	3	0	1	2.57	1253/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	780/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	926/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1201/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	122/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	149/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	164/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.11
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	43/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 5	Other	0

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tantravedi,Sari

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1015/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	902/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1231/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	942/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	727/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1075/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	870/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1027/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	156/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	385/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1260/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	506/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	556/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	780/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	926/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1201/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tantravedi,Sari

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	122/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	149/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	164/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.11
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	43/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	144/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	575/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	816/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	708/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	499/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	726/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1397/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	742/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	710/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	637/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	916/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	800/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1194/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	38/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	57/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	55/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	42/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	38/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.64

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gantert-Festin,

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	144/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	575/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	816/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	708/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	499/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	726/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1397/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	742/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	911/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	854/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1322/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	916/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1372/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Gantert-Festin,

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	38/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	57/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	55/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	42/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	38/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.64

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	3	2	0	3.00	1485/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	1508/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	1327/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	2.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1367/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	3	1	3.29	1305/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	1399/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	0	3	0	2.71	1471/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1002/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1438/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1325/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1358/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1192/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1372/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1237/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1257/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1273/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	1.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1260/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	912/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	183/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	180/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	186/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	185/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	169/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	75/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	2.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	71/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	2.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	63/66	3.00	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	75/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	1.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	40/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Temburnikar,K.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	3	2	0	3.00	1485/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	1508/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	1327/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	2.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1367/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	3	1	3.29	1305/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	1399/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	0	3	0	2.71	1471/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1002/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1450/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1389/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1427/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1401/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1404/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1258/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1257/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1273/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	1.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1260/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	912/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Temburnikar,K.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	183/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	180/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	186/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	185/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	169/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	75/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	2.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	71/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	2.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	63/66	3.00	3.57	4.27	4.00	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	75/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	1.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	40/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Temburnikar,K.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	6	8	4.38	795/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1191/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	1139/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1247/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	779/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	845/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	7	3	3.38	1365/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	900/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	542/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	735/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	645/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	683/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1132/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	1	3	4	1	3.09	1186/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1108/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1253/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1229/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	122/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	149/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	138/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	156/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	4	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	126/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	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 responses to be significant					
				P	0										
				I	0	Other			0						
				?	2										

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Peters,Hannah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	6	8	4.38	795/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1191/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	1139/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1247/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	779/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	845/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	7	3	3.38	1365/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	900/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1308/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1280/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1422/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1286/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1295/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1102/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1108/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1253/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1229/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Peters,Hannah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	122/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	149/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	138/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	156/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	4	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	126/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Peters,Hannah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	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 responses to be significant					
				P	0										
				I	0	Other			0						
				?	2										

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	6	4.31	865/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1057/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1215/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1147/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	851/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	976/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	995/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	434/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	818/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	742/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	874/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	870/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1116/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	138/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	131/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	167/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	143/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	134/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		
				Other	0

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Wauchope,Orrett

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	6	4.31	865/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1057/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1215/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1147/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	851/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	976/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	995/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	579/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	806/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	1252/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	812/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	997/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Wauchope,Orrett

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	138/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	131/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	167/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	143/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	134/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	5	6	4.21	962/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1064/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1070/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	844/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	940/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1032/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	995/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1149/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1045/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1127/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1152/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1188/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	664/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	961/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1152/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1083/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	26/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	26/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	35/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	93/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	29/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	3.00	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ginevan,Brandon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	5	6	4.21	962/1528	4.29	3.97	4.31	4.34	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1064/1527	4.17	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1070/1333	3.87	3.90	4.34	4.34	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	844/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	940/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.13	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1032/1425	3.98	3.80	4.12	4.17	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	995/1508	3.81	3.88	4.18	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1526	4.74	4.61	4.66	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	616/1490	4.02	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	478/1428	4.45	4.31	4.49	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	917/1436	4.51	4.44	4.74	4.74	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	541/1427	4.24	4.06	4.32	4.31	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1029/1425	4.11	4.02	4.34	4.34	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	327/1291	3.49	3.78	4.05	4.09	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	961/1271	3.52	3.73	4.16	4.19	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1152/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1083/1273	3.36	3.65	4.38	4.40	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/922	2.83	3.67	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ginevan,Brandon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	26/198	4.32	4.11	4.16	4.26	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	26/208	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	35/194	4.55	4.60	4.56	4.59	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	93/194	4.33	4.31	4.37	4.37	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	29/176	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.33	4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	2.50	3.48	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	3.08	3.26	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	3.00	3.57	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	1.50	2.99	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	2.95	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	2.38	2.38	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	3.00	3.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	3.50	3.50	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ginevan,Brandon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 420 1
Title:	Comupter Appl In Chem
Instructor:	Mang,Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	12	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.97	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1527	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	237/1333	4.80	3.90	4.34	4.37	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	154/1495	4.83	3.88	4.25	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1314/1439	3.25	3.80	4.11	4.20	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	396/1425	4.50	3.80	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	284/1508	4.67	3.88	4.18	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.61	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	191/1490	4.70	3.80	4.11	4.19	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	199/1428	4.92	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.92	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	202/1427	4.83	4.06	4.32	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.02	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	112/1291	4.80	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	319/1271	4.67	3.73	4.16	4.33	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1276	4.50	3.87	4.33	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	507/1273	4.67	3.65	4.38	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 420 1
Title:	Comupter Appl In Chem
Instructor:	Mang,Stephen A.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.11	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.29	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.31	4.37	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.12	4.23	3.87	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	2	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 433 01
Title:	Biochem Of Nucleic Acids
Instructor:	Karpel,R L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1465/1528	3.20	3.97	4.31	4.39	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	4	1	3.10	1472/1527	3.10	3.96	4.28	4.30	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1319/1333	2.90	3.90	4.34	4.37	2.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1444/1495	3.13	3.88	4.25	4.33	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	1291/1439	3.33	3.80	4.11	4.20	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1379/1425	2.83	3.80	4.12	4.26	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	2.67	1474/1508	2.67	3.88	4.18	4.24	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	601/1526	4.89	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	0	4	0	3.14	1387/1490	3.14	3.80	4.11	4.19	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	2	3	0	2.60	1417/1428	2.60	4.31	4.49	4.54	2.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1406/1436	3.80	4.44	4.74	4.75	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	2.90	1389/1427	2.90	4.06	4.32	4.37	2.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1390/1425	2.80	4.02	4.34	4.37	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	0	3	2	1	2.60	1251/1291	2.60	3.78	4.05	4.10	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	4	0	0	2.57	1242/1271	2.57	3.73	4.16	4.33	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1200/1276	3.29	3.87	4.33	4.49	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1152/1273	3.57	3.65	4.38	4.55	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	912/922	2.00	3.67	4.02	4.23	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 433 01
Title:	Biochem Of Nucleic Acids
Instructor:	Karpel,R L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Garcin,Elsa D.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	191
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	1	6	12	18	4.27	897/1528	4.27	3.97	4.31	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	12	17	6	3.73	1326/1527	3.73	3.96	4.28	4.30	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	15	12	8	3.68	1196/1333	3.68	3.90	4.34	4.37	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	29	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/1495	****	3.88	4.25	4.33	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	7	14	13	4.11	788/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.20	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	28	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	****/1425	****	3.80	4.12	4.26	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	3	7	8	16	3.84	1185/1508	3.84	3.88	4.18	4.24	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	340/1526	4.95	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	3	18	9	0	3.06	1400/1490	3.42	3.80	4.11	4.19	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	6	10	18	4.14	1157/1428	4.28	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	6	10	8	11	3.54	1419/1436	4.12	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	4	10	13	9	3.75	1226/1427	3.90	4.06	4.32	4.37	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	6	14	12	3.84	1193/1425	3.93	4.02	4.34	4.37	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	0	1	6	10	9	4.04	711/1291	4.19	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	35	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Garcin,Elsa D.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	191
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 8		Graduate 3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3 C 9	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5 D 0		Under-grad 38
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	9 F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 12		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Bush,C A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	191
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	1	6	12	18	4.27	897/1528	4.27	3.97	4.31	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	12	17	6	3.73	1326/1527	3.73	3.96	4.28	4.30	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	15	12	8	3.68	1196/1333	3.68	3.90	4.34	4.37	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	29	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	****/1495	****	3.88	4.25	4.33	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	7	14	13	4.11	788/1439	4.11	3.80	4.11	4.20	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	28	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	****/1425	****	3.80	4.12	4.26	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	3	7	8	16	3.84	1185/1508	3.84	3.88	4.18	4.24	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	340/1526	4.95	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	10	15	5	3.77	1136/1490	3.42	3.80	4.11	4.19	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	5	11	21	4.43	931/1428	4.28	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	996/1436	4.12	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	6	13	14	4.06	1060/1427	3.90	4.06	4.32	4.37	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	6	10	17	4.03	1069/1425	3.93	4.02	4.34	4.37	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	0	0	5	7	14	4.35	472/1291	4.19	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	35	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Bush,C A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	191
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.50	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.50	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 8		Graduate 3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3 C 9	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5 D 0		Under-grad 38
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	9 F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 12	Other	0

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L O2
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	5	2	1	2	3.00	1485/1528	3.50	3.97	4.31	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1113/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1179/1333	3.79	3.90	4.34	4.37	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1267/1495	4.07	3.88	4.25	4.33	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1361/1439	3.25	3.80	4.11	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1167/1425	3.93	3.80	4.12	4.26	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	758/1508	4.17	3.88	4.18	4.24	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.23	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	0	3.70	1180/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.19	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	909/1428	4.34	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	964/1436	4.56	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	812/1427	4.26	4.06	4.32	4.37	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1076/1425	3.88	4.02	4.34	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	728/1291	3.60	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	98/198	4.45	4.11	4.16	4.37	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	23/208	4.63	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	144/194	4.63	4.60	4.56	4.52	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	116/194	4.49	4.31	4.37	4.45	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	159/176	3.77	4.12	4.23	3.87	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	13

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L O2
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Seeger, Franzisk

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	5	2	1	2	3.00	1485/1528	3.50	3.97	4.31	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1113/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1179/1333	3.79	3.90	4.34	4.37	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1267/1495	4.07	3.88	4.25	4.33	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1361/1439	3.25	3.80	4.11	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1167/1425	3.93	3.80	4.12	4.26	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	758/1508	4.17	3.88	4.18	4.24	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.23	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1180/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.19	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1428	4.34	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1436	4.56	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1427	4.26	4.06	4.32	4.37	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1425	3.88	4.02	4.34	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	3.60	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	98/198	4.45	4.11	4.16	4.37	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	23/208	4.63	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	144/194	4.63	4.60	4.56	4.52	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	116/194	4.49	4.31	4.37	4.45	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	159/176	3.77	4.12	4.23	3.87	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 19
Title: Biochemistry Laboratory		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4			
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13	Non-major 12
84-150 2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 0			
		I 0	Other 0		
		? 3			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	5	5	4.00	1140/1528	3.50	3.97	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1257/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.30	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	1121/1333	3.79	3.90	4.34	4.37	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	640/1495	4.07	3.88	4.25	4.33	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1216/1439	3.25	3.80	4.11	4.20	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	669/1425	3.93	3.80	4.12	4.26	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	995/1508	4.17	3.88	4.18	4.24	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1101/1526	4.23	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1257/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.19	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	1093/1428	4.34	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	1268/1436	4.56	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1000/1427	4.26	4.06	4.32	4.37	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1222/1425	3.88	4.02	4.34	4.37	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	3	4	1	3.20	1160/1291	3.60	3.78	4.05	4.10	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	48/198	4.45	4.11	4.16	4.37	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	85/208	4.63	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	44/194	4.63	4.60	4.56	4.52	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	74/194	4.49	4.31	4.37	4.45	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	113/176	3.77	4.12	4.23	3.87	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Bediako,Bernice

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	5	5	4.00	1140/1528	3.50	3.97	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1257/1527	3.92	3.96	4.28	4.30	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	1121/1333	3.79	3.90	4.34	4.37	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	640/1495	4.07	3.88	4.25	4.33	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1216/1439	3.25	3.80	4.11	4.20	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	669/1425	3.93	3.80	4.12	4.26	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	995/1508	4.17	3.88	4.18	4.24	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1101/1526	4.23	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	0	3.80	1118/1490	3.69	3.80	4.11	4.19	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1428	4.34	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1436	4.56	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1427	4.26	4.06	4.32	4.37	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1425	3.88	4.02	4.34	4.37	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1291	3.60	3.78	4.05	4.10	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Bediako, Bernice

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	48/198	4.45	4.11	4.16	4.37	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	85/208	4.63	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	44/194	4.63	4.60	4.56	4.52	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	74/194	4.49	4.31	4.37	4.45	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	113/176	3.77	4.12	4.23	3.87	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Other	0

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 451 1
Title:	Mech Of Organic Reaction
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	25	4.70	390/1528	4.70	3.97	4.31	4.39	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	11	18	4.32	829/1527	4.32	3.96	4.28	4.30	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	21	4.47	606/1333	4.47	3.90	4.34	4.37	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	6	6	13	4.19	912/1495	4.19	3.88	4.25	4.33	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	6	10	8	5	3.19	1333/1439	3.19	3.80	4.11	4.20	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	5	10	11	3.87	1008/1425	3.87	3.80	4.12	4.26	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	8	18	4.15	908/1508	4.15	3.88	4.18	4.24	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	18	11	4.18	1350/1526	4.18	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	11	15	4.43	464/1490	4.43	3.80	4.11	4.19	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	11	21	4.61	735/1428	4.61	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	30	4.88	612/1436	4.88	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	13	13	4.15	1000/1427	4.15	4.06	4.32	4.37	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	22	4.45	741/1425	4.45	4.02	4.34	4.37	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	4	3	1	2	4	2.93	1218/1291	2.93	3.78	4.05	4.10	2.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	3	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.67	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 451 1
Title:	Mech Of Organic Reaction
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	3.48	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	3.26	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	3.57	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	2.99	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	11	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	24
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 470 01
Title:	Toxicological Chemistry
Instructor:	Fishbein,James

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	265/1528	4.79	3.97	4.31	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	841/1527	4.32	3.96	4.28	4.30	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	542/1333	4.53	3.90	4.34	4.37	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1002/1495	4.11	3.88	4.25	4.33	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	2	5	6	3.50	1216/1439	3.50	3.80	4.11	4.20	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	6	6	3.84	1024/1425	3.84	3.80	4.12	4.26	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	771/1508	4.26	3.88	4.18	4.24	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1193/1526	4.37	4.61	4.66	4.71	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	579/1490	4.33	3.80	4.11	4.19	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	515/1428	4.74	4.31	4.49	4.54	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	310/1436	4.95	4.44	4.74	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	863/1427	4.32	4.06	4.32	4.37	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	515/1425	4.63	4.02	4.34	4.37	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	2	0	7	3	3.50	1061/1291	3.50	3.78	4.05	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1271	****	3.73	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1276	****	3.87	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1273	****	3.65	4.38	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 470 01
Title:	Toxicological Chemistry
Instructor:	Fishbein,James

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	19

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 684 2
Title:	Spec Topics In Chemistry
Instructor:	Geddes,Christop

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.97	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1527	5.00	3.96	4.28	4.36	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	564/1333	4.50	3.90	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	5.00	3.88	4.25	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	851/1439	4.00	3.80	4.11	4.24	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	3.80	4.12	4.28	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1508	4.75	3.88	4.18	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1285/1526	4.25	4.61	4.66	4.81	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	156/1490	4.75	3.80	4.11	4.16	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.31	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.44	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.06	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.02	4.34	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1291	5.00	3.78	4.05	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	3.73	4.16	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	439/1276	4.67	3.87	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1273	5.00	3.65	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.67	4.02	4.00	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 684 2
Title:	Spec Topics In Chemistry
Instructor:	Geddes,Christop

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 713 2
Title:	Biochem Seminar
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1140/1528	4.00	3.97	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1527	4.50	3.96	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	5.00	3.88	4.25	4.33	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	891/1425	4.00	3.80	4.12	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1508	5.00	3.88	4.18	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.61	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	911/1490	4.00	3.80	4.11	4.16	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.31	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1382/1436	4.00	4.44	4.74	4.83	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.06	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.02	4.34	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1291	5.00	3.78	4.05	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	5.00	3.73	4.16	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1276	5.00	3.87	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1273	5.00	3.65	4.38	4.52	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 713 2
Title:	Biochem Seminar
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General			0	Under-grad	1	Non-major			0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0										
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	1										
				I	0	Other			0						
				?	0										