

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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	2	13	27	13	3.68	1334/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	14	20	18	3.73	1285/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	5	12	17	22	3.80	1078/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	5	6	13	12	12	3.42	1367/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	2	9	23	17	3.75	1040/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	6	4	3	9	8	3.30	1278/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	12	17	23	3.91	1090/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	22	35	4.61	1012/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	3	4	16	17	11	3.57	1263/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	11	21	25	4.12	1186/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	21	32	4.41	1268/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	6	13	15	18	3.57	1302/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	8	6	9	13	21	3.58	1293/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	3	4	12	15	18	3.79	904/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	10	19	18	3.76	927/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	3	9	11	27	4.00	922/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	6	7	9	18	14	3.50	1141/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	4	4	7	14	22	3.90	542/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	25	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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	2	13	27	13	3.68	1334/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	14	20	18	3.73	1285/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	5	12	17	22	3.80	1078/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	5	6	13	12	12	3.42	1367/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	2	9	23	17	3.75	1040/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	6	4	3	9	8	3.30	1278/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	12	17	23	3.91	1090/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	22	35	4.61	1012/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	4	0	1	22	18	3	3.52	1279/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	3	5	14	19	4.12	1186/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	2	5	18	17	4.19	1358/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	2	8	20	8	3.75	1241/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	5	2	9	13	10	3.54	1303/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	3	5	5	11	11	3	3.06	1206/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	10	19	18	3.76	927/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	3	9	11	27	4.00	922/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	6	7	9	18	14	3.50	1141/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	4	4	7	14	22	3.90	542/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	25	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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	2	13	27	13	3.68	1334/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	14	20	18	3.73	1285/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	5	12	17	22	3.80	1078/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	5	6	13	12	12	3.42	1367/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	2	9	23	17	3.75	1040/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	6	4	3	9	8	3.30	1278/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	12	17	23	3.91	1090/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	22	35	4.61	1012/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	3	2	5	23	9	4	3.19	1388/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	4	5	6	9	8	3.38	1407/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	3	5	8	13	6	3.40	1453/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	4	10	12	5	3.50	1319/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	5	3	11	7	6	3.19	1384/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	4	4	6	7	7	0	2.71	1265/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	10	19	18	3.76	927/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	3	9	11	27	4.00	922/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	6	7	9	18	14	3.50	1141/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	4	4	7	14	22	3.90	542/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	25	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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	2	13	27	13	3.68	1334/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	14	20	18	3.73	1285/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	5	12	17	22	3.80	1078/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	5	6	13	12	12	3.42	1367/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	2	9	23	17	3.75	1040/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	6	4	3	9	8	3.30	1278/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	12	17	23	3.91	1090/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	22	35	4.61	1012/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	1	3	22	11	4	3.34	1345/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	5	5	5	9	8	3.31	1413/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	3	5	9	14	4	3.31	1456/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	1	3	11	14	5	3.56	1305/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	4	4	9	9	5	3.23	1377/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	5	3	8	6	6	0	2.65	1269/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	10	19	18	3.76	927/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	3	9	11	27	4.00	922/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	6	7	9	18	14	3.50	1141/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	4	4	7	14	22	3.90	542/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	69
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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	25	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	60	Non-major	59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
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	0	0	1	8	15	18	12	3.59	1367/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	17	17	7	3.26	1437/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	10	15	15	11	3.39	1219/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	11	14	10	5	3.17	1427/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	6	14	17	12	3.56	1163/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	6	4	6	6	5	3.00	1331/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	11	12	13	14	3.41	1355/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	22	30	4.52	1118/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	11	4	12	10	3	2.75	1464/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	5	5	13	15	13	3.51	1386/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	3	2	10	15	20	3.94	1409/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	11	8	12	12	7	2.92	1413/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	9	9	9	10	12	3.14	1389/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	4	12	10	10	7	3.09	1202/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	8	4	11	17	8	3.27	1135/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	4	9	15	16	3.67	1086/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	6	14	14	10	3.47	1149/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	5	4	11	9	16	3.60	679/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
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	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	54

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	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	A	15	Required for Majors	46	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
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	0	0	1	8	15	18	12	3.59	1367/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	17	17	7	3.26	1437/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	10	15	15	11	3.39	1219/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	11	14	10	5	3.17	1427/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	6	14	17	12	3.56	1163/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	6	4	6	6	5	3.00	1331/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	11	12	13	14	3.41	1355/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	22	30	4.52	1118/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	5	3	16	12	0	2.97	1423/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	3	1	7	10	13	3.85	1304/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	2	3	11	19	4.25	1338/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	4	3	13	5	9	3.35	1354/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	2	5	8	9	8	3.50	1311/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	6	3	0	9	8	6	3.54	1045/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	8	4	11	17	8	3.27	1135/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	4	9	15	16	3.67	1086/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	6	14	14	10	3.47	1149/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	5	4	11	9	16	3.60	679/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
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	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	54

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	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99 3	A 15	Required for Majors 46	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 16	General 1	Under-grad 54 Non-major 53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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	
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Kim,Lisa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
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	0	0	1	8	15	18	12	3.59	1367/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	17	17	7	3.26	1437/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	10	15	15	11	3.39	1219/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	11	14	10	5	3.17	1427/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	6	14	17	12	3.56	1163/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	6	4	6	6	5	3.00	1331/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	11	12	13	14	3.41	1355/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	22	30	4.52	1118/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	14	13	8	3.83	1083/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	1	0	8	9	12	4.03	1218/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	7	9	15	4.26	1338/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	1	15	5	9	3.73	1249/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	3	8	7	9	3.71	1248/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	8	1	0	9	3	7	3.75	927/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	8	4	11	17	8	3.27	1135/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	4	9	15	16	3.67	1086/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	6	14	14	10	3.47	1149/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	5	4	11	9	16	3.60	679/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Kim,Lisa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
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	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Kim,Lisa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	54

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	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99 3	A 15	Required for Majors 46	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 16	General 1	Under-grad 54 Non-major 53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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	
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Taylor,Rachel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
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	0	0	1	8	15	18	12	3.59	1367/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	17	17	7	3.26	1437/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	10	15	15	11	3.39	1219/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	11	14	10	5	3.17	1427/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	6	14	17	12	3.56	1163/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	6	4	6	6	5	3.00	1331/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	11	12	13	14	3.41	1355/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	22	30	4.52	1118/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	10	11	14	4.11	811/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	6	9	16	4.32	1037/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	4	7	20	4.52	1187/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	11	7	13	4.06	1046/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	4	6	9	10	3.86	1189/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	8	0	1	8	4	8	3.90	830/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	8	4	11	17	8	3.27	1135/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	4	9	15	16	3.67	1086/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	6	14	14	10	3.47	1149/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	5	4	11	9	16	3.60	679/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Taylor,Rachel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
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	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Taylor,Rachel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	54

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	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99 3	A 15	Required for Majors	46
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 16	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	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 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	3	7	12	16	10	3.48	1418/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	9	21	9	3.52	1371/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	7	10	21	7	3.46	1198/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	1	12	17	1	3.50	1334/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	5	5	19	14	3.78	1022/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	5	3	9	6	1	2.79	1366/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	2.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	8	11	11	16	3.65	1272/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	26	4.55	1076/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	6	15	14	3	3.25	1372/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	5	18	18	4.02	1222/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	0	6	14	21	4.21	1357/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	9	3	6	16	10	3.34	1356/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	4	5	14	15	3.64	1275/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	2	8	8	13	8	3.44	1091/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	8	1	8	13	8	3.32	1122/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	6	8	12	12	3.72	1072/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	5	9	11	11	3.63	1102/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	5	1	5	14	9	3.62	674/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2 A 8	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1 B 17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 17	General	1	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6 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				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	3	7	12	16	10	3.48	1418/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	9	21	9	3.52	1371/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	7	10	21	7	3.46	1198/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	1	12	17	1	3.50	1334/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	5	5	19	14	3.78	1022/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	5	3	9	6	1	2.79	1366/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	2.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	8	11	11	16	3.65	1272/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	26	4.55	1076/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	2	3	16	11	0	3.13	1403/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	2	1	3	10	11	4.00	1230/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	2	1	3	8	11	4.00	1394/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	2	4	3	11	5	3.52	1313/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	5	2	5	6	6	3.25	1370/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	5	3	2	4	6	5	3.40	1106/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	8	1	8	13	8	3.32	1122/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	6	8	12	12	3.72	1072/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	5	9	11	11	3.63	1102/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	5	1	5	14	9	3.62	674/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2 A 8	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1 B 17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 17	General	1	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6 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				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Kim,Lisa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	3	7	12	16	10	3.48	1418/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	9	21	9	3.52	1371/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	7	10	21	7	3.46	1198/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	1	12	17	1	3.50	1334/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	5	5	19	14	3.78	1022/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	5	3	9	6	1	2.79	1366/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	2.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	8	11	11	16	3.65	1272/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	26	4.55	1076/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	2	11	13	3	3.59	1255/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	2	0	3	6	10	4.05	1214/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	1313/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	2	1	9	8	4.15	996/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1140/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	5	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	987/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	8	1	8	13	8	3.32	1122/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	6	8	12	12	3.72	1072/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	5	9	11	11	3.63	1102/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	5	1	5	14	9	3.62	674/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Kim,Lisa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2 A 8	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1 B 17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 17	General	1	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6 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				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	White,Mike

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	3	7	12	16	10	3.48	1418/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	9	21	9	3.52	1371/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	7	10	21	7	3.46	1198/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	1	12	17	1	3.50	1334/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	5	5	19	14	3.78	1022/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	5	3	9	6	1	2.79	1366/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	2.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	8	11	11	16	3.65	1272/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	26	4.55	1076/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	0	6	14	9	4.10	822/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	2	0	2	8	10	4.09	1195/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	1288/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	2	0	8	11	4.33	842/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1073/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	5	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	987/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	8	1	8	13	8	3.32	1122/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	6	8	12	12	3.72	1072/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	5	9	11	11	3.63	1102/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	5	1	5	14	9	3.62	674/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	White, Mike

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	17	General	1	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	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				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	0	0	6	6	10	18	14	3.52	1404/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	8	6	20	15	3.59	1350/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	6	4	12	18	13	3.53	1177/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	7	4	9	13	6	3.18	1427/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	5	5	11	15	13	3.53	1172/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	24	6	1	5	9	6	3.30	1280/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	5	1	8	16	19	3.88	1125/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	21	25	4.51	1118/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	8	4	7	21	5	3.24	1374/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	2	9	12	24	3.92	1273/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	3	5	12	30	4.19	1360/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	8	8	8	16	13	3.34	1357/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	3	13	8	19	3.48	1316/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	7	9	10	8	15	3.31	1143/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	2	9	10	24	3.81	903/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	5	10	14	19	3.80	1036/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	4	12	13	17	3.65	1099/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	5	4	9	7	21	3.76	615/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.76

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	49	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	54

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	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	0	0	6	6	10	18	14	3.52	1404/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	8	6	20	15	3.59	1350/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	6	4	12	18	13	3.53	1177/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	7	4	9	13	6	3.18	1427/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	5	5	11	15	13	3.53	1172/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	24	6	1	5	9	6	3.30	1280/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	5	1	8	16	19	3.88	1125/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	21	25	4.51	1118/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	2	16	17	2	3.51	1283/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	6	9	23	4.36	1011/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	2	4	12	20	4.32	1313/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	2	8	14	12	3.92	1153/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	1	8	11	13	3.76	1234/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	4	5	7	4	12	3.47	1076/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	2	9	10	24	3.81	903/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	5	10	14	19	3.80	1036/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	4	12	13	17	3.65	1099/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	5	4	9	7	21	3.76	615/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.76

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	49	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	54

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	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	0	0	6	6	10	18	14	3.52	1404/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	8	6	20	15	3.59	1350/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	6	4	12	18	13	3.53	1177/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	7	4	9	13	6	3.18	1427/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	5	5	11	15	13	3.53	1172/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	24	6	1	5	9	6	3.30	1280/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	5	1	8	16	19	3.88	1125/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	21	25	4.51	1118/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	1	0	8	17	4	3.77	1129/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	7	6	12	4.20	1132/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	2	3	8	14	4.26	1338/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	9	8	9	4.00	1075/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	5	7	9	3.91	1163/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	4	2	3	5	3	5	3.33	1131/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	2	9	10	24	3.81	903/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	5	10	14	19	3.80	1036/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	4	12	13	17	3.65	1099/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	5	4	9	7	21	3.76	615/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.76

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	49	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	54

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	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	0	0	6	6	10	18	14	3.52	1404/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	8	6	20	15	3.59	1350/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	6	4	12	18	13	3.53	1177/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	7	4	9	13	6	3.18	1427/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	5	5	11	15	13	3.53	1172/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	24	6	1	5	9	6	3.30	1280/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	5	1	8	16	19	3.88	1125/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	21	25	4.51	1118/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	4	0	1	8	18	2	3.72	1159/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	0	7	6	11	4.17	1156/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	2	3	8	14	4.26	1338/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	0	8	8	9	4.04	1056/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	0	2	0	5	7	7	3.81	1217/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	4	2	3	5	2	5	3.29	1145/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	2	9	10	24	3.81	903/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	5	10	14	19	3.80	1036/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	4	12	13	17	3.65	1099/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	5	4	9	7	21	3.76	615/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.76

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	49	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	54

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	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

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	2	7	6	11	16	3.76	1297/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	7	14	17	4.05	1060/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	14	18	4.10	929/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	2	6	11	8	3.82	1171/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	8	12	17	3.98	841/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	1	1	8	8	3	3.52	1187/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	7	9	22	4.17	836/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	10	29	4.74	864/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	7	7	17	5	3.42	1314/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	5	12	23	4.26	1093/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	5	13	23	4.33	1308/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	9	6	14	11	3.55	1308/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	4	15	15	3.74	1238/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	2	10	14	12	3.73	942/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	20	12	4.00	766/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	3	17	16	4.15	844/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	7	19	12	4.08	926/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	0	10	5	18	4.06	440/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

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	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

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	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 3	A 15	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 8	General 5	Under-grad 43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 43
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

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	2	7	6	11	16	3.76	1297/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	7	14	17	4.05	1060/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	14	18	4.10	929/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	2	6	11	8	3.82	1171/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	8	12	17	3.98	841/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	1	1	8	8	3	3.52	1187/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	7	9	22	4.17	836/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	10	29	4.74	864/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	1	8	13	5	3.81	1091/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	2	1	10	14	4.33	1028/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	1172/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	8	8	9	3.85	1191/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	2	3	7	10	3.88	1184/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	8	2	2	4	7	6	3.62	1013/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	20	12	4.00	766/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	3	17	16	4.15	844/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	7	19	12	4.08	926/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	0	10	5	18	4.06	440/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

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	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

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	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	15	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

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	2	7	6	11	16	3.76	1297/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	7	14	17	4.05	1060/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	14	18	4.10	929/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	2	6	11	8	3.82	1171/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	8	12	17	3.98	841/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	1	1	8	8	3	3.52	1187/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	7	9	22	4.17	836/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	10	29	4.74	864/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	3	18	6	4.11	811/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	984/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	1238/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	547/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	888/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	8	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	436/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	20	12	4.00	766/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	3	17	16	4.15	844/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	7	19	12	4.08	926/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	0	10	5	18	4.06	440/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

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	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

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	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	15	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	White,Mike

Term - Fall 2011

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	2	7	6	11	16	3.76	1297/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	7	14	17	4.05	1060/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	14	18	4.10	929/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	2	6	11	8	3.82	1171/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	8	12	17	3.98	841/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	1	1	8	8	3	3.52	1187/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	7	9	22	4.17	836/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	10	29	4.74	864/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	1	19	7	4.22	695/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	984/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	1238/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	547/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	888/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	8	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	436/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	20	12	4.00	766/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	3	17	16	4.15	844/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	7	19	12	4.08	926/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	0	10	5	18	4.06	440/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	White, Mike

Term - Fall 2011

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	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	White,Mike

Term - Fall 2011

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	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	15	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	4	3	5	18	23	4.00	1118/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	9	13	23	3.89	1200/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	2	8	14	24	4.12	909/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	6	2	8	12	14	3.62	1276/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	9	13	25	3.98	828/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	4	1	5	6	11	3.70	1099/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	4	8	10	26	3.91	1101/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	18	34	4.62	1001/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	4	4	7	19	12	3.67	1195/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	2	5	12	29	4.22	1124/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	4	9	35	4.52	1180/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	4	8	14	21	3.86	1185/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	9	11	22	3.80	1217/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	5	3	4	16	22	3.94	789/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	8	12	18	3.69	976/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	5	9	29	4.25	770/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	8	11	22	3.92	1010/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	5	2	9	5	19	3.78	611/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	0	0	2	5.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	54

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	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 4	A 23	Required for Majors 41	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 11	General 5	Under-grad 53 Non-major 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	4	3	5	18	23	4.00	1118/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	9	13	23	3.89	1200/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	2	8	14	24	4.12	909/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	6	2	8	12	14	3.62	1276/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	9	13	25	3.98	828/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	4	1	5	6	11	3.70	1099/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	4	8	10	26	3.91	1101/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	18	34	4.62	1001/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	4	2	1	13	19	6	3.63	1225/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	1	2	2	5	21	4.39	984/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	2	1	4	4	22	4.30	1319/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	1	2	3	8	18	4.25	920/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	4	1	3	6	16	3.97	1124/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	5	1	2	2	5	15	4.24	547/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	8	12	18	3.69	976/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	5	9	29	4.25	770/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	8	11	22	3.92	1010/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	5	2	9	5	19	3.78	611/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	0	0	2	5.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	54

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	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 4	A 23	Required for Majors 41	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 11	General 5	Under-grad 53 Non-major 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	4	3	5	18	23	4.00	1118/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	9	13	23	3.89	1200/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	2	8	14	24	4.12	909/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	6	2	8	12	14	3.62	1276/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	9	13	25	3.98	828/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	4	1	5	6	11	3.70	1099/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	4	8	10	26	3.91	1101/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	18	34	4.62	1001/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	2	4	9	15	12	3.74	1151/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	0	4	5	18	4.28	1078/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	2	2	6	6	16	4.00	1394/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	1	5	3	21	4.35	819/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	2	4	6	15	3.93	1147/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	9	1	3	1	4	12	4.10	674/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	8	12	18	3.69	976/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	5	9	29	4.25	770/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	8	11	22	3.92	1010/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	5	2	9	5	19	3.78	611/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	0	0	2	5.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	54

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	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	4	A	23	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	5	Under-grad	53	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	4	3	5	18	23	4.00	1118/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	9	13	23	3.89	1200/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	2	8	14	24	4.12	909/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	6	2	8	12	14	3.62	1276/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	9	13	25	3.98	828/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	4	1	5	6	11	3.70	1099/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	4	8	10	26	3.91	1101/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	18	34	4.62	1001/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	1	1	14	14	12	3.83	1075/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	0	4	5	18	4.28	1078/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	2	1	4	7	18	4.19	1360/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	1	4	5	20	4.35	819/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	3	5	5	16	3.97	1124/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	9	1	3	1	4	12	4.10	674/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	8	12	18	3.69	976/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	5	9	29	4.25	770/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	8	11	22	3.92	1010/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	5	2	9	5	19	3.78	611/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
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	0	0	2	5.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	54

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	52	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	4	A	23	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	5	Under-grad	53	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	2	16	13	13	3.78	1292/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	18	14	12	3.78	1258/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	2	13	14	12	3.74	1103/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1307/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	0	8	13	17	3.93	906/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	2	8	9	8	3.75	1071/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	6	11	9	17	3.67	1258/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	13	30	4.70	922/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	0	11	20	8	3.92	995/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	3	6	6	26	4.34	1019/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	15	24	4.50	1195/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	5	16	17	4.20	964/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	2	11	6	19	3.81	1217/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	3	13	7	17	3.88	847/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	4	12	11	12	3.53	1048/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	5	11	11	16	3.82	1031/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	3	16	10	11	3.53	1132/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	3	11	10	10	3.38	746/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	44	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	2	16	13	13	3.78	1292/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	18	14	12	3.78	1258/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	2	13	14	12	3.74	1103/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1307/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	0	8	13	17	3.93	906/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	2	8	9	8	3.75	1071/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	6	11	9	17	3.67	1258/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	13	30	4.70	922/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	2	2	9	18	3	3.53	1279/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	8	4	14	4.15	1168/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	2	12	16	4.47	1224/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	3	7	8	10	3.89	1167/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	2	5	7	2	11	3.56	1298/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	2	5	8	7	6	3.36	1124/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	4	12	11	12	3.53	1048/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	5	11	11	16	3.82	1031/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	3	16	10	11	3.53	1132/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	3	11	10	10	3.38	746/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	44	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	2	16	13	13	3.78	1292/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	18	14	12	3.78	1258/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	2	13	14	12	3.74	1103/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1307/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	0	8	13	17	3.93	906/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	2	8	9	8	3.75	1071/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	6	11	9	17	3.67	1258/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	13	30	4.70	922/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	4	0	0	6	12	6	4.00	891/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	1108/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	1180/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	1	7	2	9	4.00	1075/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	2	5	2	1	8	3.44	1327/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	5	0	4	6	1	4	3.33	1131/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	4	12	11	12	3.53	1048/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	5	11	11	16	3.82	1031/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	3	16	10	11	3.53	1132/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	3	11	10	10	3.38	746/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	44	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	2	16	13	13	3.78	1292/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	18	14	12	3.78	1258/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	2	13	14	12	3.74	1103/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	2	4	9	11	8	3.56	1307/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	0	8	13	17	3.93	906/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	2	8	9	8	3.75	1071/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	6	11	9	17	3.67	1258/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	13	30	4.70	922/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	5	1	2	6	13	1	3.48	1297/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	1	5	2	9	4.12	1186/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	1376/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	1	7	1	9	3.84	1196/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	3	5	2	0	8	3.28	1365/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	5	0	3	6	2	4	3.47	1076/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	4	12	11	12	3.53	1048/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	5	11	11	16	3.82	1031/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	3	16	10	11	3.53	1132/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	3	11	10	10	3.38	746/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	44	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	47

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	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	59

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	3	13	18	23	4.02	1112/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	18	18	20	3.95	1147/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	17	14	23	4.00	974/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	3	14	16	8	3.71	1236/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	1	9	15	26	4.11	734/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	11	7	6	3.68	1108/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	7	19	26	4.10	916/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	22	34	4.61	1024/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	2	2	14	16	15	3.82	1091/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	6	23	25	4.27	1085/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	17	35	4.55	1157/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	10	22	19	3.96	1109/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	5	19	22	3.88	1184/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	3	14	9	23	4.00	729/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	5	7	17	17	3.71	965/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	4	10	12	22	3.90	989/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	17	13	15	3.69	1084/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	3	2	12	12	17	3.83	589/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	59

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2 A 23	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4 C 9	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 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				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	59

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	3	13	18	23	4.02	1112/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	18	18	20	3.95	1147/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	17	14	23	4.00	974/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	3	14	16	8	3.71	1236/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	1	9	15	26	4.11	734/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	11	7	6	3.68	1108/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	7	19	26	4.10	916/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	22	34	4.61	1024/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	0	25	15	4	3.52	1279/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	6	10	15	4.29	1062/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	4	11	21	4.47	1216/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	2	4	14	13	4.15	996/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	2	6	12	12	3.97	1124/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	4	2	1	8	6	9	3.73	942/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	5	7	17	17	3.71	965/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	4	10	12	22	3.90	989/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	17	13	15	3.69	1084/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	3	2	12	12	17	3.83	589/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	59

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2 A 23	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4 C 9	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 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				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	59

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	3	13	18	23	4.02	1112/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	18	18	20	3.95	1147/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	17	14	23	4.00	974/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	3	14	16	8	3.71	1236/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	1	9	15	26	4.11	734/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	11	7	6	3.68	1108/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	7	19	26	4.10	916/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	22	34	4.61	1024/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	1	0	14	21	5	3.71	1174/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	1	5	9	9	4.08	1199/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	1238/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	37	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	807/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	5	9	7	3.95	1132/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	5	0	2	10	2	6	3.60	1019/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	5	7	17	17	3.71	965/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	4	10	12	22	3.90	989/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	17	13	15	3.69	1084/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	3	2	12	12	17	3.83	589/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	59

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	23	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Taylor,Rachel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	59

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	3	13	18	23	4.02	1112/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	18	18	20	3.95	1147/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	17	14	23	4.00	974/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	3	14	16	8	3.71	1236/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	1	9	15	26	4.11	734/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	11	7	6	3.68	1108/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	7	19	26	4.10	916/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	22	34	4.61	1024/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	1	1	13	21	5	3.68	1188/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	1	5	10	8	4.04	1214/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	1268/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	37	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	761/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	1	4	9	7	3.91	1171/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	5	0	1	10	3	6	3.70	966/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	5	7	17	17	3.71	965/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	4	10	12	22	3.90	989/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	17	13	15	3.69	1084/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	3	2	12	12	17	3.83	589/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Taylor,Rachel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	59

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2 A 23	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4 C 9	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 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				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	15	24	19	3.92	1208/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	7	11	16	27	3.98	1106/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	6	13	21	19	3.85	1055/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	4	3	12	15	12	3.61	1281/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	11	15	25	3.87	963/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	3	2	9	8	3	3.24	1294/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	8	14	31	4.12	904/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	25	32	4.53	1097/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	5	1	12	30	6	3.57	1259/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	8	11	36	4.21	1124/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	9	8	43	4.51	1195/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	4	9	26	16	3.69	1268/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	3	7	20	23	3.82	1212/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	6	11	15	24	3.86	853/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	18	16	17	3.66	993/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	14	16	25	4.07	898/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	1	15	14	19	3.66	1091/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	5	6	9	9	21	3.70	636/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	3	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	62	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	15	24	19	3.92	1208/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	7	11	16	27	3.98	1106/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	6	13	21	19	3.85	1055/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	4	3	12	15	12	3.61	1281/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	11	15	25	3.87	963/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	3	2	9	8	3	3.24	1294/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	8	14	31	4.12	904/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	25	32	4.53	1097/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	2	1	17	29	1	3.52	1279/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	1	7	14	18	4.15	1168/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	0	4	11	29	4.49	1209/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	1	7	18	9	3.84	1202/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	4	2	6	13	13	3.76	1231/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	4	4	2	9	14	9	3.58	1030/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	18	16	17	3.66	993/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	14	16	25	4.07	898/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	1	15	14	19	3.66	1091/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	5	6	9	9	21	3.70	636/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	3	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	62	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	15	24	19	3.92	1208/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	7	11	16	27	3.98	1106/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	6	13	21	19	3.85	1055/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	4	3	12	15	12	3.61	1281/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	11	15	25	3.87	963/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	3	2	9	8	3	3.24	1294/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	8	14	31	4.12	904/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	25	32	4.53	1097/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	2	0	18	25	3	3.56	1263/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	3	9	9	8	3.67	1361/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	0	8	11	17	4.16	1364/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	2	1	6	15	5	3.69	1268/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	5	0	6	10	7	3.50	1311/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	5	4	1	10	8	5	3.32	1135/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	18	16	17	3.66	993/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	14	16	25	4.07	898/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	1	15	14	19	3.66	1091/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	5	6	9	9	21	3.70	636/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	3	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	62	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	15	24	19	3.92	1208/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	7	11	16	27	3.98	1106/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	6	13	21	19	3.85	1055/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	4	3	12	15	12	3.61	1281/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	11	15	25	3.87	963/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	3	2	9	8	3	3.24	1294/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	8	14	31	4.12	904/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	25	32	4.53	1097/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	1	17	28	1	3.56	1263/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	3	10	8	8	3.63	1368/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	0	10	12	14	4.03	1390/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	2	3	7	13	4	3.48	1324/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	4	2	5	10	7	3.50	1311/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	5	4	2	9	8	5	3.29	1148/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	18	16	17	3.66	993/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	14	16	25	4.07	898/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	1	15	14	19	3.66	1091/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	5	6	9	9	21	3.70	636/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	3	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	62

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	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	62	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
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	0	0	1	4	9	15	25	4.09	1064/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	13	30	4.26	893/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	13	6	32	4.26	809/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	3	1	10	14	11	3.74	1214/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	5	20	22	4.18	684/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	1	2	10	5	10	3.75	1071/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	6	13	29	4.23	781/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	4.63	1001/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	10	26	9	3.89	1029/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	8	39	4.63	664/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	5	43	4.70	1012/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	7	3	12	29	4.11	1021/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	0	4	10	35	4.36	844/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	6	4	11	7	21	3.67	981/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	7	12	23	3.78	921/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	2	9	12	28	4.11	874/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	15	15	21	3.98	961/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.98
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	3	5	9	8	23	3.90	547/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	54

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	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	A	27	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
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	0	0	1	4	9	15	25	4.09	1064/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	13	30	4.26	893/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	13	6	32	4.26	809/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	3	1	10	14	11	3.74	1214/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	5	20	22	4.18	684/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	1	2	10	5	10	3.75	1071/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	6	13	29	4.23	781/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	4.63	1001/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	2	3	12	14	2	3.33	1349/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	760/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	2	4	5	20	4.28	1326/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	1	2	5	6	14	4.07	1042/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	8	8	12	4.07	1068/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	4	1	1	8	8	7	3.76	919/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	7	12	23	3.78	921/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	2	9	12	28	4.11	874/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	15	15	21	3.98	961/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.98
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	3	5	9	8	23	3.90	547/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	54

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	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	A	27	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
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	0	0	1	4	9	15	25	4.09	1064/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	13	30	4.26	893/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	13	6	32	4.26	809/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	3	1	10	14	11	3.74	1214/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	5	20	22	4.18	684/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	1	2	10	5	10	3.75	1071/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	6	13	29	4.23	781/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	4.63	1001/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	0	0	11	16	5	3.81	1091/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	712/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	5	7	16	4.39	1273/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	6	4	14	4.33	842/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	5	4	14	4.29	909/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	5	2	1	4	3	10	3.90	830/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	7	12	23	3.78	921/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	2	9	12	28	4.11	874/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	15	15	21	3.98	961/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.98
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	3	5	9	8	23	3.90	547/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	54

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	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	A	27	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	White,Mike

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
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	0	0	1	4	9	15	25	4.09	1064/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	13	30	4.26	893/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	13	6	32	4.26	809/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	3	1	10	14	11	3.74	1214/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	5	20	22	4.18	684/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	1	2	10	5	10	3.75	1071/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	6	13	29	4.23	781/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	4.63	1001/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	0	0	11	16	5	3.81	1091/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	712/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	6	6	15	4.33	1303/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	6	4	14	4.33	842/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	5	4	14	4.29	909/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	6	1	1	5	3	9	3.95	789/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	7	12	23	3.78	921/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	2	9	12	28	4.11	874/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	15	15	21	3.98	961/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.98
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	3	5	9	8	23	3.90	547/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 12
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	White, Mike

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	54

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	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3	A	27	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	2	13	18	15	3.73	1312/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	12	14	18	3.76	1269/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	8	10	18	13	3.68	1128/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	3	5	9	13	11	3.59	1291/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	6	9	15	16	3.77	1028/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	1	4	4	10	10	3.83	1026/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	4	16	8	18	3.75	1214/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	0	1	15	31	4.64	990/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	4	4	15	13	7	3.35	1345/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	2	5	13	26	4.10	1192/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	3	1	3	12	31	4.34	1298/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	7	4	11	9	19	3.58	1297/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	7	11	11	16	3.63	1279/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	7	9	14	14	3.67	981/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	5	6	12	22	4.00	766/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	12	13	17	3.85	1012/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	5	10	12	16	3.78	1059/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	6	9	8	20	3.98	481/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.98

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	47	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	3	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	2	Under-grad	50	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	2	13	18	15	3.73	1312/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	12	14	18	3.76	1269/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	8	10	18	13	3.68	1128/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	3	5	9	13	11	3.59	1291/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	6	9	15	16	3.77	1028/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	1	4	4	10	10	3.83	1026/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	4	16	8	18	3.75	1214/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	0	1	15	31	4.64	990/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	2	4	11	11	6	3.44	1307/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	1	4	9	18	4.18	1150/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	2	2	3	4	23	4.29	1322/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	3	1	7	12	11	3.79	1224/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	2	3	6	3	8	12	3.63	1279/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	4	2	1	9	9	8	3.69	976/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	5	6	12	22	4.00	766/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	12	13	17	3.85	1012/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	5	10	12	16	3.78	1059/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	6	9	8	20	3.98	481/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.98

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	47	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 40	Graduate 3 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 9	General 2	Under-grad 50 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 3	F 1	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	2	13	18	15	3.73	1312/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	12	14	18	3.76	1269/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	8	10	18	13	3.68	1128/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	3	5	9	13	11	3.59	1291/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	6	9	15	16	3.77	1028/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	1	4	4	10	10	3.83	1026/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	4	16	8	18	3.75	1214/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	0	1	15	31	4.64	990/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	3	1	1	8	12	6	3.75	1136/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	3	0	8	5	6	3.50	1386/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	2	0	7	4	12	3.96	1404/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	2	0	6	6	7	3.76	1236/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	5	4	4	6	3.58	1293/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	3	1	4	3	5	5	3.50	1057/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	5	6	12	22	4.00	766/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	12	13	17	3.85	1012/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	5	10	12	16	3.78	1059/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	6	9	8	20	3.98	481/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.98

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	47	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 40	Graduate 3 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 9	General 2	Under-grad 50 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 3	F 1	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	2	13	18	15	3.73	1312/1520	3.78	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	12	14	18	3.76	1269/1520	3.80	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	8	10	18	13	3.68	1128/1291	3.81	3.85	4.33	4.24	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	3	5	9	13	11	3.59	1291/1483	3.54	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	6	9	15	16	3.77	1028/1417	3.86	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	1	4	4	10	10	3.83	1026/1405	3.44	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	4	16	8	18	3.75	1214/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	0	1	15	31	4.64	990/1519	4.61	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	4	2	1	9	11	4	3.52	1283/1495	3.61	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	3	0	8	5	6	3.50	1386/1459	4.11	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	2	1	6	5	11	3.88	1422/1460	4.27	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	2	0	6	5	8	3.81	1220/1455	3.90	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	5	4	4	6	3.58	1293/1456	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	3	1	4	3	5	5	3.50	1057/1316	3.62	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	5	6	12	22	4.00	766/1243	3.68	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	12	13	17	3.85	1012/1241	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	5	10	12	16	3.78	1059/1236	3.72	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	6	9	8	20	3.98	481/889	3.77	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.98

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	47	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 14
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	53

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	49	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 40	Graduate 3 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 9	General 2	Under-grad 50 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 3	F 1	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 03
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Garcin,Elsa D.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
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	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1271/1520	3.82	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1189/1520	3.91	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	895/1483	4.17	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1417	****	3.77	4.08	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1405	****	3.66	4.12	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	999/1504	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	8	0	3.80	1099/1495	3.38	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1004/1243	3.64	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	445/1241	4.64	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	757/1236	4.36	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 03
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Garcin,Elsa D.

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	456/889	4.00	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	4 A 11	Required for Majors	10 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
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
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			0 ? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 03
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
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	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1271/1520	3.82	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1189/1520	3.91	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	895/1483	4.17	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1417	****	3.77	4.08	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1405	****	3.66	4.12	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	999/1504	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1203/1495	3.38	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1004/1243	3.64	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	445/1241	4.64	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	757/1236	4.36	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 03
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	456/889	4.00	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	4 A 11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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			
			0 P 0						
			0 I 0	Other	0				
			0 ? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 03
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
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	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1271/1520	3.82	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1189/1520	3.91	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	895/1483	4.17	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1417	****	3.77	4.08	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1405	****	3.66	4.12	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	999/1504	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1472/1495	3.38	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1004/1243	3.64	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	445/1241	4.64	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	757/1236	4.36	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101H 03
Title:	Prin Of Chem I - Honors
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	456/889	4.00	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	4 A 11	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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			
			0 P 0						
			0 I 0	Other	0				
			0 ? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	46

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	5	8	12	11	9	3.24	1477/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	11	15	8	6	2.93	1488/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	12	8	9	10	6	2.78	1277/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	5	7	6	7	3	2.86	1460/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	4	11	8	13	3.68	1083/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	2	2	5	3	4	3.31	1274/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	9	12	15	3.77	1208/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	42	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	8	6	14	5	1	2.56	1480/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	5	14	9	13	3.49	1389/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	3	8	10	22	3.98	1401/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	11	10	6	6	11	2.91	1417/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	11	5	12	7	10	3.00	1402/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	7	2	12	8	12	3.39	1109/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	13	7	10	3.30	1126/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	2	7	7	20	3.93	975/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	13	10	12	3.65	1095/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	5	3	4	7	14	3.67	653/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	46

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	42	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0 A 5	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0 B 14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4 C 14	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3 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				
			? 11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	46

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	5	8	12	11	9	3.24	1477/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	11	15	8	6	2.93	1488/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	12	8	9	10	6	2.78	1277/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	5	7	6	7	3	2.86	1460/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	4	11	8	13	3.68	1083/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	2	2	5	3	4	3.31	1274/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	9	12	15	3.77	1208/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	42	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	4	1	19	9	1	3.06	1411/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	2	2	7	6	18	4.03	1222/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	3	4	9	20	4.19	1360/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	3	3	10	10	10	3.58	1297/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	6	2	10	7	9	3.32	1355/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	8	3	3	6	3	13	3.71	958/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	13	7	10	3.30	1126/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	2	7	7	20	3.93	975/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	13	10	12	3.65	1095/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	5	3	4	7	14	3.67	653/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	46

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	42	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	46

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	5	8	12	11	9	3.24	1477/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	11	15	8	6	2.93	1488/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	12	8	9	10	6	2.78	1277/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	5	7	6	7	3	2.86	1460/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	4	11	8	13	3.68	1083/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	2	2	5	3	4	3.31	1274/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	9	12	15	3.77	1208/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	42	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	1	1	9	10	8	3.79	1106/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	2	4	6	11	4.00	1230/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	2	3	8	13	4.11	1374/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	0	3	10	11	4.08	1042/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	1	0	7	6	10	4.00	1094/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	8	2	1	1	6	6	3.81	883/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	13	7	10	3.30	1126/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	2	7	7	20	3.93	975/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	13	10	12	3.65	1095/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	5	3	4	7	14	3.67	653/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	46

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	42	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	46

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	5	8	12	11	9	3.24	1477/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	11	15	8	6	2.93	1488/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	12	8	9	10	6	2.78	1277/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	5	7	6	7	3	2.86	1460/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	4	11	8	13	3.68	1083/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	2	2	5	3	4	3.31	1274/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	9	12	15	3.77	1208/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	42	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	3	12	8	6	3.59	1255/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	1257/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	3	4	8	9	3.84	1427/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	3	1	5	8	7	3.63	1286/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	1	1	8	7	6	3.70	1255/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	8	2	1	1	6	5	3.73	942/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	13	7	10	3.30	1126/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	2	7	7	20	3.93	975/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	13	10	12	3.65	1095/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	5	3	4	7	14	3.67	653/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Young,Sheena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	46

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	42	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	6	12	11	10	3.29	1470/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	10	6	13	8	8	2.96	1484/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	2.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	10	4	16	6	7	2.91	1271/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	8	7	7	4	5	2.71	1467/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	2.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	5	1	8	9	14	3.70	1070/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	6	0	4	5	3	2.94	1348/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	3	10	13	13	3.65	1268/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	39	4.86	672/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	8	5	14	8	0	2.63	1475/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	9	10	11	6	8	2.86	1448/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	3	6	11	21	4.00	1394/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	14	6	11	6	6	2.63	1441/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	15	8	4	8	8	2.67	1439/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	9	5	7	6	8	2.97	1220/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	7	3	12	10	3.17	1164/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	7	2	5	14	12	3.55	1122/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	2	8	14	9	3.40	1161/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	5	3	9	6	10	3.39	740/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
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				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	6	12	11	10	3.29	1470/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	10	6	13	8	8	2.96	1484/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	2.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	10	4	16	6	7	2.91	1271/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	8	7	7	4	5	2.71	1467/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	2.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	5	1	8	9	14	3.70	1070/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	6	0	4	5	3	2.94	1348/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	3	10	13	13	3.65	1268/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	39	4.86	672/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	4	5	6	12	3	3.17	1393/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	2	2	2	18	4.36	1002/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	2	2	4	18	4.33	1303/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	3	1	3	8	8	3.74	1249/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	2	4	3	11	3.74	1241/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	0	3	1	4	6	10	3.79	896/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	7	3	12	10	3.17	1164/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	7	2	5	14	12	3.55	1122/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	2	8	14	9	3.40	1161/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	5	3	9	6	10	3.39	740/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
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				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Taylor,Rachel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	6	12	11	10	3.29	1470/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	10	6	13	8	8	2.96	1484/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	2.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	10	4	16	6	7	2.91	1271/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	8	7	7	4	5	2.71	1467/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	2.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	5	1	8	9	14	3.70	1070/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	6	0	4	5	3	2.94	1348/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	3	10	13	13	3.65	1268/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	39	4.86	672/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	0	6	14	6	3.89	1037/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	498/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	1001/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	525/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	620/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	0	2	1	0	3	10	4.13	651/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	7	3	12	10	3.17	1164/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	7	2	5	14	12	3.55	1122/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	2	8	14	9	3.40	1161/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	5	3	9	6	10	3.39	740/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Taylor,Rachel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Taylor,Rachel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
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				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	6	12	11	10	3.29	1470/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	10	6	13	8	8	2.96	1484/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	2.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	10	4	16	6	7	2.91	1271/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	8	7	7	4	5	2.71	1467/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	2.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	5	1	8	9	14	3.70	1070/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	6	0	4	5	3	2.94	1348/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	3	10	13	13	3.65	1268/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	39	4.86	672/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	1	1	7	12	5	3.73	1151/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	664/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	1060/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	603/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	756/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	0	1	2	1	2	10	4.13	651/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	7	3	12	10	3.17	1164/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	7	2	5	14	12	3.55	1122/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	2	8	14	9	3.40	1161/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	5	3	9	6	10	3.39	740/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	46

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	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
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				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	2	0	4	3	14	14	6	3.37	1450/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	7	4	15	11	5	3.07	1460/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	8	12	8	5	2.81	1275/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	3	5	13	7	7	3.29	1404/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	4	3	12	9	7	3.34	1249/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	3	4	6	3	5	3.14	1315/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	7	12	6	13	3.46	1332/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	39	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	4	6	10	8	2	2.93	1434/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	8	4	12	8	9	3.15	1429/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	4	2	8	26	4.32	1313/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	9	7	10	9	5	2.85	1422/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	8	11	5	7	2.83	1425/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	4	3	9	11	8	3.46	1081/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	6	1	2	11	10	3.60	1021/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	3	6	18	4.23	785/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	5	2	4	8	10	3.55	1127/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	135/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0 B 12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	40
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6 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	1				
			? 10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	2	0	4	3	14	14	6	3.37	1450/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	7	4	15	11	5	3.07	1460/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	8	12	8	5	2.81	1275/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	3	5	13	7	7	3.29	1404/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	4	3	12	9	7	3.34	1249/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	3	4	6	3	5	3.14	1315/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	7	12	6	13	3.46	1332/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	39	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	2	10	12	5	3.69	1188/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	6	8	15	4.31	1046/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	1150/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	7	13	8	3.97	1109/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	3	7	5	8	3.67	1265/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	3	0	5	9	8	3.76	919/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	6	1	2	11	10	3.60	1021/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	3	6	18	4.23	785/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	5	2	4	8	10	3.55	1127/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	135/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0 B 12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	40
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6 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	1				
			? 10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	2	0	4	3	14	14	6	3.37	1450/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	7	4	15	11	5	3.07	1460/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	8	12	8	5	2.81	1275/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	3	5	13	7	7	3.29	1404/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	4	3	12	9	7	3.34	1249/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	3	4	6	3	5	3.14	1315/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	7	12	6	13	3.46	1332/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	39	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	1	6	10	6	3.91	1008/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1186/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1195/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	911/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	2	3	9	4.06	1068/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	2	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	853/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	6	1	2	11	10	3.60	1021/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	3	6	18	4.23	785/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	5	2	4	8	10	3.55	1127/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,Nicol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	135/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	40
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	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	1				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
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	2	0	4	3	14	14	6	3.37	1450/1520	3.30	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	7	4	15	11	5	3.07	1460/1520	2.99	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	8	12	8	5	2.81	1275/1291	2.83	3.85	4.33	4.24	2.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	3	5	13	7	7	3.29	1404/1483	2.95	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	4	3	12	9	7	3.34	1249/1417	3.58	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	19	3	4	6	3	5	3.14	1315/1405	3.13	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	7	12	6	13	3.46	1332/1504	3.63	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	39	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	863/1495	3.42	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1180/1459	3.98	4.22	4.47	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	1260/1460	4.30	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	819/1455	3.76	3.97	4.32	4.26	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1068/1456	3.67	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	2	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	799/1316	3.72	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	6	1	2	11	10	3.60	1021/1243	3.36	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	3	6	18	4.23	785/1241	3.90	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	5	2	4	8	10	3.55	1127/1236	3.53	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Fedorowski,Jenn

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	135/889	3.91	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0 B 12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2 C 10	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	40
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6 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	1				
			? 10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
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	1	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	1049/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	912/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	756/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	493/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	803/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	605/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	949/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	288/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	552/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	1001/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	334/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	683/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	528/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	339/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	666/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	947/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
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	6	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	38/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	21/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	43/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	16/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	59/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
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	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Varma,Rajeev

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
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	1	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	1049/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	912/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	756/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	493/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	803/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	605/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	949/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	532/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	784/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	544/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	163/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	425/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	659/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	339/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	666/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	947/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Varma,Rajeev

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
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	6	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	38/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	21/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	43/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	16/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	59/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Varma,Rajeev

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
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	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	2	6	8	4.38	790/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	499/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	546/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	493/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	650/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	635/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	656/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	652/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	842/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	286/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	435/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	387/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	439/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	215/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	493/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	686/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	891/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	653/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	4	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	95/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	50/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	33/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	10/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sundaran,Anand

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	2	6	8	4.38	790/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	499/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	546/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	493/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	650/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	635/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	656/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	652/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	568/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	552/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	779/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	401/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	200/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	493/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	686/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	891/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	653/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sundaran,Anand

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	4	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	95/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	50/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	33/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	10/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sundaran,Anand

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	1168/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	912/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	473/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1010/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	395/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	818/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	8	7	4.00	999/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	780/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	552/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	272/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	637/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	735/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	338/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	897/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	922/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	947/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	571/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	55/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	28/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	55/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	40/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	31/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	16	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	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 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	1168/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	912/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	473/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1010/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	395/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	818/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	8	7	4.00	999/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1225/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	1230/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	1326/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	4	1	3	5	3.50	1319/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1194/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	987/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	897/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	922/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	947/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	571/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	55/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	28/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	55/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	40/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	31/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	16	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	651/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	306/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	462/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	474/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	93/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	354/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	476/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	627/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	251/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	622/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	194/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	503/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	256/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

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	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	92/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	16/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	33/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	76/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst, Casey

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	651/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	306/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	462/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	474/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	93/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	354/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	476/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	891/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	712/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	779/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	788/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst, Casey

Term - Fall 2011

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	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	92/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	16/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	33/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	76/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	2	2	4	8	4	3.50	1409/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	2	10	3.95	1137/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	924/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	2	6	7	3.89	1135/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	773/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	977/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	7	1	5	3.10	1422/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	0	3	15	4.55	1076/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	738/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	6	11	4.37	1002/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	942/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	2	14	4.42	736/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	6	9	4.05	1073/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	847/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

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	7	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	108/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	70/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	62/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	132/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	44/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.46

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	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 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Bediako,Bernice

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	2	2	4	8	4	3.50	1409/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	2	10	3.95	1137/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	924/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	2	6	7	3.89	1135/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	773/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	977/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	7	1	5	3.10	1422/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	0	3	15	4.55	1076/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	8	1	3.67	1203/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1371/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	0	6	4	3.92	1417/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1241/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	1	3	1	2.60	1443/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Bediako, Bernice

Term - Fall 2011

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	7	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	108/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	70/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	62/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	132/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	44/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.46

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives				
				P	0					
				I	0	Other				
				?	4					

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
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	7	7	8	3.91	1208/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	874/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	7	4.09	934/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	7	3.91	1112/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	7	7	4.00	803/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	5	8	3	3.47	1210/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	8	6	3.68	1253/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	296/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	484/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	18	4.61	712/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	845/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	674/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	714/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	227/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	1021/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1196/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1127/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
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	3	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	95/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	85/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	93/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	3	1	2	4	9	3.79	135/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	3.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	5	6	7	3.90	94/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	3.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
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	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	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 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning, Ben

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
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	7	7	8	3.91	1208/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	874/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	7	4.09	934/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	7	3.91	1112/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	7	7	4.00	803/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	5	8	3	3.47	1210/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	8	6	3.68	1253/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	296/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	3	1	5	6	0	2.93	1434/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	1132/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	1	0	17	4.55	1157/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	2	4	10	4.00	1075/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	1	9	7	4.00	1094/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	1	4	8	3	3.50	1057/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	1021/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1196/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	3.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1127/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
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	3	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	95/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	85/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	93/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	3	1	2	4	9	3.79	135/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	3.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	5	6	7	3.90	94/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	3.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
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	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	1	1	2	8	8	4.05	1088/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	1022/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	773/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	778/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	578/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	677/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	916/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	801/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	427/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	727/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	581/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	810/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	557/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	987/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	837/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1091/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

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	9	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	66/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	54/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	19/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	82/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	85/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst, Casey

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	1	1	2	8	8	4.05	1088/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	1022/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	773/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	778/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	578/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	677/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	916/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	849/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	900/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	727/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	842/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	735/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	538/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	987/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	837/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1091/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst, Casey

Term - Fall 2011

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	9	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	66/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	54/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	19/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	82/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	85/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
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	0	1	2	11	4.71	335/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	92/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	255/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	263/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	338/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	211/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	437/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	141/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	159/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	435/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	130/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	342/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	145/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	405/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	564/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	829/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
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	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	24/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	10/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	17/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	14/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	15/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.77
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

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	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Varma,Rajeev

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
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	0	1	2	11	4.71	335/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	92/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	255/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	263/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	338/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	211/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	437/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	114/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	199/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	544/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	163/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	200/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	405/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	564/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	829/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Varma,Rajeev

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
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	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	24/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	10/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	17/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	14/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	15/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.77
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Varma,Rajeev

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

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	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	8
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	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	517/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	695/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	894/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	895/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1097/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	843/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1142/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	457/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	387/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	918/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	233/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	186/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	8
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	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	33/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	128/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	30/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	33/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	99/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	3.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	8
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	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	517/1520	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	695/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	894/1291	4.38	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	895/1483	4.28	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1097/1417	4.23	3.77	4.08	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	843/1405	4.16	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1142/1504	4.01	3.88	4.16	4.13	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1519	4.91	4.80	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	801/1495	4.17	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1028/1459	4.56	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1048/1460	4.75	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1202/1455	4.47	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1265/1456	4.32	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	462/1316	4.36	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1243	4.23	3.67	4.17	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	4.22	4.00	4.33	4.14	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.09	3.77	4.40	4.19	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	186/889	4.01	3.71	4.02	3.89	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	8
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	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	33/164	4.37	4.13	4.15	4.13	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	128/165	4.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	30/160	4.80	4.51	4.45	4.49	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	33/158	4.59	4.37	4.36	4.43	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	99/150	4.34	3.96	4.05	4.26	3.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 123 1
Title:	Gen Organic & Biochem I
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	104
Questionnaires:	55

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	15	38	4.65	413/1520	4.65	3.95	4.31	4.14	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	13	37	4.56	499/1520	4.56	3.88	4.27	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	19	30	4.47	591/1291	4.47	3.85	4.33	4.24	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	0	3	12	24	4.45	564/1483	4.45	3.72	4.23	4.09	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	2	6	9	19	4.16	692/1417	4.16	3.77	4.08	4.02	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	374/1405	4.52	3.66	4.12	3.96	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	12	41	4.74	199/1504	4.74	3.88	4.16	4.13	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	9	35	9	3.96	1456/1519	3.96	4.80	4.70	4.71	3.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	18	29	4.58	279/1495	4.58	3.72	4.11	4.01	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	45	4.85	304/1459	4.85	4.22	4.47	4.40	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	48	4.92	435/1460	4.92	4.42	4.74	4.68	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	14	38	4.73	361/1455	4.73	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	45	4.87	246/1456	4.87	3.89	4.34	4.26	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	33	1	2	1	1	12	4.24	557/1316	4.24	3.81	4.03	3.91	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	1	4	2	16	4.16	692/1243	4.16	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	2	0	3	5	16	4.27	763/1241	4.27	4.00	4.33	4.14	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	632/1236	4.52	3.77	4.40	4.19	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	30	20	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 123 1
Title:	Gen Organic & Biochem I
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	104
Questionnaires:	55

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	54	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 13	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1 B 14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5 C 14	General	0	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3 D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	1	3	6	4	4	3.39	1444/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	2	4	3.39	1408/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	4	4	3.61	1155/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1379/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	4	1	4	2.88	1380/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1236/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	5	5	3.39	1362/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	4	6	2	3	3.00	1415/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	1078/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	1409/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	5	1	5	3.11	1393/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1298/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	1	1	2	4	3.27	1151/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	2	4	6	3.33	1115/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1048/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	3	4	6	3.39	1164/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	6	0	1	4	3	2.86	854/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	2.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	8	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	113/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	117/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	123/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	151/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	1	0	2	4	3.30	130/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	1	3	6	4	4	3.39	1444/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	2	4	3.39	1408/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	4	4	3.61	1155/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1379/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	4	1	4	2.88	1380/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1236/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	5	5	3.39	1362/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	7	4	2	3.25	1372/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1320/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1442/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1319/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1291/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	2	4	6	3.33	1115/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1048/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	3	4	6	3.39	1164/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	6	0	1	4	3	2.86	854/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	2.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	8	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	113/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	117/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	123/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	151/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	1	0	2	4	3.30	130/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	1	3	6	4	4	3.39	1444/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	2	4	3.39	1408/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	4	4	3.61	1155/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1379/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	4	1	4	2.88	1380/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1236/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	5	5	3.39	1362/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	8	0	3.33	1349/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1361/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1394/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1319/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1265/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	2	4	6	3.33	1115/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1048/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	3	4	6	3.39	1164/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	6	0	1	4	3	2.86	854/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	2.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 02
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	8	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	113/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	117/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	123/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	151/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	1	0	2	4	3.30	130/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	1	3	6	4	4	3.39	1444/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	2	4	3.39	1408/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	4	4	3.61	1155/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1379/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	4	1	4	2.88	1380/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1236/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	5	5	3.39	1362/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	8	3	3.75	1136/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1351/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1157/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1173/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1311/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	2	4	6	3.33	1115/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1048/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	3	4	6	3.39	1164/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.39
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	6	0	1	4	3	2.86	854/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	2.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	8	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	113/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	117/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	123/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	151/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	1	0	2	4	3.30	130/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	2	1	5	3	6	3.59	1372/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	6	2	3.12	1455/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	5	3	3.41	1211/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	3	5	2	3.42	1367/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	2	4	2	0	2.23	1405/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	2.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	1	3	1	1	2.40	1388/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	999/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	2	6	4	1	3.00	1415/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	552/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	1216/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	5	3	5	3.41	1343/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	5	4	3.24	1375/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	4	1	7	2	1	2.67	1268/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	2.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	4	3	2.82	1212/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	2	4	9	4.06	902/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	0	2	5	7	3.76	1062/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	2	1	6	1	2	3.00	822/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	1	0	0	2	6	5	3	3.56	140/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	143/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	80/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	120/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	112/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	2	1	5	3	6	3.59	1372/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	6	2	3.12	1455/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	5	3	3.41	1211/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	3	5	2	3.42	1367/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	2	4	2	0	2.23	1405/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	2.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	1	3	1	1	2.40	1388/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	999/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	3	9	0	3.36	1341/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	374/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1444/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1346/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1327/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	2.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	4	3	2.82	1212/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	2	4	9	4.06	902/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	0	2	5	7	3.76	1062/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	2	1	6	1	2	3.00	822/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	1	0	0	2	6	5	3	3.56	140/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	143/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	80/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	120/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	112/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	2	1	5	3	6	3.59	1372/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	6	2	3.12	1455/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	5	3	3.41	1211/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	3	5	2	3.42	1367/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	2	4	2	0	2.23	1405/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	2.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	1	3	1	1	2.40	1388/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	999/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1181/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1028/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1349/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1002/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1234/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1255/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	2.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	4	3	2.82	1212/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	2	4	9	4.06	902/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	0	2	5	7	3.76	1062/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	2	1	6	1	2	3.00	822/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	1	0	0	2	6	5	3	3.56	140/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	143/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	80/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	120/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	112/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	2	1	5	3	6	3.59	1372/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	6	2	3.12	1455/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	5	3	3.41	1211/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	3	5	2	3.42	1367/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	2	4	2	0	2.23	1405/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	2.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	1	3	1	1	2.40	1388/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	999/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	8	3	0	3.27	1367/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1028/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1374/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	795/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1234/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1294/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	2.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	4	3	2.82	1212/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	2	4	9	4.06	902/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	0	2	5	7	3.76	1062/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	2	1	6	1	2	3.00	822/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
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	1	0	0	2	6	5	3	3.56	140/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	143/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	80/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	120/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	112/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	Graduate	Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	Under-grad	Non-major
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		
				P	0			
				I	0	Other		
				?	4			

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	2	3	3	5	3.85	1253/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1460/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1195/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1457/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1330/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	1398/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1390/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1457/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1284/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1444/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	3	2	0	2.45	1445/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	0	3	1	3	2.91	1417/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1131/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	4	1	3	3.09	1179/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	0	3	4	3.45	1146/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1211/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	811/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	6	0	1	3	0	2	2	3.13	150/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	122/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	136/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	145/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	145/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	2.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	2	3	3	5	3.85	1253/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1460/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1195/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1457/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1330/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	1398/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1390/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	2	7	0	3.08	1409/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1292/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1435/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	2	0	3	3.00	1400/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	2	0	3	3.00	1402/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1057/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	4	1	3	3.09	1179/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	0	3	4	3.45	1146/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1211/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	811/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	6	0	1	3	0	2	2	3.13	150/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	122/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	136/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	145/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	145/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	2.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	2	3	3	5	3.85	1253/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1460/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1195/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1457/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1330/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	1398/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1390/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	738/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	1304/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1426/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1319/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1265/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	729/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	4	1	3	3.09	1179/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	0	3	4	3.45	1146/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1211/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	811/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	6	0	1	3	0	2	2	3.13	150/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	122/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	136/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	145/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	145/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	2.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	2	3	3	5	3.85	1253/1520	3.61	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1460/1520	3.19	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1195/1291	3.49	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1457/1483	3.23	3.72	4.23	4.25	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1330/1417	2.73	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	1398/1405	2.61	3.66	4.12	4.13	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1390/1504	3.57	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1519	4.97	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	822/1495	3.40	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1348/1459	4.08	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1426/1460	3.98	4.42	4.74	4.72	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1319/1455	3.48	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1265/1456	3.48	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	729/1316	3.25	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	4	1	3	3.09	1179/1243	3.08	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	0	3	4	3.45	1146/1241	3.76	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1211/1236	3.35	3.77	4.40	4.41	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	811/889	2.99	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	6	0	1	3	0	2	2	3.13	150/164	3.56	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	122/165	3.78	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	136/160	4.24	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	145/158	3.55	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	145/150	3.27	3.96	4.05	3.98	2.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 301 1
Title:	Physical Chemistry I
Instructor:	Arnold,Bradley

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	85
Questionnaires:	31

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	2	2	8	16	4.24	934/1520	4.24	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	6	20	4.52	569/1520	4.52	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	395/1291	4.66	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	2	0	3	1	11	4.12	949/1483	4.12	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	0	8	7	7	3.32	1257/1417	3.32	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	750/1405	4.15	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	282/1504	4.66	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	3	13	7	4.04	863/1495	4.04	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	286/1459	4.86	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	218/1460	4.96	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	4	20	4.57	558/1455	4.57	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	21	4.67	503/1456	4.67	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	927/1316	3.75	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 301 1
Title:	Physical Chemistry I
Instructor:	Arnold,Bradley

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	85
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	26
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
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	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	725/1520	4.31	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	948/1520	4.31	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	1	7	10	4.15	906/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	13	4	3.90	932/1417	3.95	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	525/1405	4.58	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	924/1504	4.15	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	794/1519	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	1	6	3	0	3.20	1384/1495	3.77	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1168/1459	4.23	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1048/1460	4.54	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1075/1455	4.05	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1027/1456	3.95	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	603/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
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	9	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	95/164	4.33	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	58/165	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	67/160	4.56	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	77/158	4.67	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	62/150	3.90	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Mang,Stephen

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
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	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	725/1520	4.31	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	948/1520	4.31	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	1	7	10	4.15	906/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	13	4	3.90	932/1417	3.95	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	525/1405	4.58	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	924/1504	4.15	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	794/1519	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	891/1495	3.77	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	873/1459	4.23	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	1048/1460	4.54	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	970/1455	4.05	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	963/1456	3.95	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	698/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Mang,Stephen

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
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	9	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	95/164	4.33	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	58/165	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	67/160	4.56	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	77/158	4.67	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	62/150	3.90	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
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	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	725/1520	4.31	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	948/1520	4.31	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	1	7	10	4.15	906/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	13	4	3.90	932/1417	3.95	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	525/1405	4.58	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	924/1504	4.15	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	794/1519	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	891/1495	3.77	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	833/1459	4.23	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1108/1460	4.54	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	736/1455	4.05	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	683/1456	3.95	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
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	9	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	95/164	4.33	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	58/165	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	67/160	4.56	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	77/158	4.67	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	62/150	3.90	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Winter,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
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	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	725/1520	4.31	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	948/1520	4.31	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	1	7	10	4.15	906/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	13	4	3.90	932/1417	3.95	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	525/1405	4.58	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	924/1504	4.15	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	794/1519	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	8	2	3.69	1188/1495	3.77	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1361/1459	4.23	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	1334/1460	4.54	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	946/1455	4.05	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	945/1456	3.95	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	619/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Winter,Greg

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
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	9	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	95/164	4.33	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	58/165	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	67/160	4.56	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	77/158	4.67	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	62/150	3.90	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	5	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	991/1520	4.31	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	681/1520	4.31	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	550/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	803/1417	3.95	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	162/1405	4.58	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	803/1504	4.15	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	794/1519	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1472/1495	3.77	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1407/1459	4.23	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1238/1460	4.54	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1400/1455	4.05	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	3	0	4	0	0	2.14	1452/1456	3.95	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1190/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 311L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab I
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	11	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	44/164	4.33	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	25/165	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	86/160	4.56	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	40/158	4.67	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	118/150	3.90	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	5	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	991/1520	4.31	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	681/1520	4.31	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	550/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	803/1417	3.95	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	162/1405	4.58	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	803/1504	4.15	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	794/1519	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	568/1495	3.77	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	552/1459	4.23	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1268/1460	4.54	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	964/1455	4.05	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	900/1456	3.95	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1086/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	11	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	44/164	4.33	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	25/165	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	86/160	4.56	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	40/158	4.67	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	118/150	3.90	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	5	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	991/1520	4.31	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	681/1520	4.31	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	550/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	803/1417	3.95	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	162/1405	4.58	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	803/1504	4.15	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	794/1519	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1045/1495	3.77	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1093/1459	4.23	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1157/1460	4.54	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1075/1455	4.05	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1248/1456	3.95	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	11	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	44/164	4.33	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	25/165	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	86/160	4.56	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	40/158	4.67	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	118/150	3.90	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	5	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	991/1520	4.31	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	681/1520	4.31	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	550/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	803/1417	3.95	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	162/1405	4.58	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	803/1504	4.15	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	794/1519	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	508/1495	3.77	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	463/1459	4.23	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	981/1460	4.54	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	784/1455	4.05	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	900/1456	3.95	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
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	11	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	44/164	4.33	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	25/165	4.58	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	86/160	4.56	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	40/158	4.67	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	118/150	3.90	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	235
Questionnaires:	140

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	2	2	9	31	93	4.54	555/1520	4.59	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	13	39	82	4.49	611/1520	4.52	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	3	15	48	69	4.33	756/1291	4.40	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	61	3	4	11	18	36	4.11	949/1483	4.24	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	2	7	14	24	82	4.37	502/1417	4.45	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	80	4	0	11	8	26	4.06	813/1405	4.21	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	3	2	11	29	88	4.48	463/1504	4.39	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	7	7	120	4.84	713/1519	4.90	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	34	2	1	0	7	44	52	4.40	484/1495	4.37	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	2	28	101	4.71	552/1459	4.76	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	14	118	4.85	675/1460	4.88	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	11	32	90	4.55	592/1455	4.57	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	5	9	16	100	4.54	641/1456	4.60	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	22	7	4	11	36	51	4.10	668/1316	4.12	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	130	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	129	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	130	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	130	4	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	235
Questionnaires:	140

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	137	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	137	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	137	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	137	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	137	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	138	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	138	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	139	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	139	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	139	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	139	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	139	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	235
Questionnaires:	140

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	139	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	30	Required for Majors	113	Graduate	3	Major	15
28-55	32	1.00-1.99	1	B	57						
56-83	28	2.00-2.99	10	C	25	General	1	Under-grad	137	Non-major	125
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	49	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	21						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 2
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	222
Questionnaires:	130

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	10	24	94	4.64	439/1520	4.59	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	10	31	86	4.56	513/1520	4.52	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	11	40	76	4.47	606/1291	4.40	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	41	1	1	8	30	45	4.38	669/1483	4.24	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	10	28	85	4.53	338/1417	4.45	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	86	0	1	4	16	21	4.36	555/1405	4.21	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	3	18	34	70	4.29	715/1504	4.39	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	2	122	4.95	296/1519	4.90	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	1	1	2	10	39	51	4.33	568/1495	4.37	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	4	15	104	4.81	356/1459	4.76	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	11	112	4.91	489/1460	4.88	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	10	30	83	4.59	536/1455	4.57	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	6	24	91	4.66	516/1456	4.60	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	26	5	3	15	25	49	4.13	643/1316	4.12	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	113	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	113	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	114	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	113	10	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 2
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Gierasch,Tiffan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	222
Questionnaires:	130

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	125	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	125	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	125	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	125	1	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	125	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	129	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	129	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	36	Required for Majors	107	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	34	1.00-1.99	0	B	46						
56-83	24	2.00-2.99	11	C	22	General	0	Under-grad	130	Non-major	126
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	19	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	37	F	1	Electives	1				
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	19						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
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	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	975/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	0	3.60	1347/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1151/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1296/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	955/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1002/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	1	3.20	1409/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1075/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1192/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1195/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1075/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1094/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	0	4	1	3.57	1030/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

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	0	1	3	4.20	83/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	95/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	69/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	106/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	127/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
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	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	975/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	0	3.60	1347/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1151/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1296/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	955/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1002/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	1	3.20	1409/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1398/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1411/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	1394/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	4	0	3.00	1400/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1402/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1148/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

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	0	1	3	4.20	83/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	95/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	69/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	106/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	127/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode,Tijesun

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
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	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	975/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	0	3.60	1347/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1151/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1296/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	955/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1002/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	1	3.20	1409/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1314/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1386/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1433/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1319/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1339/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1210/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode,Tijesun

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

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	0	1	3	4.20	83/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	95/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	69/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	106/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	127/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	5	7	4.19	991/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	4	3	3.50	1378/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1086/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	1382/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	6	3	3	3.27	1281/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	5	2	3.57	1161/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1214/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	773/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1247/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	886/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1172/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1220/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	1189/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	865/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1187/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1036/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1191/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	790/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	113/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	95/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	100/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	97/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	94/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	5	7	4.19	991/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	4	3	3.50	1378/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1086/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	1382/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	6	3	3	3.27	1281/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	5	2	3.57	1161/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1214/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	773/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	5	3	0	3.00	1415/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1329/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1142/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	3	3	3.36	1354/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	2	5	3.50	1311/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	809/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1187/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1036/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1191/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	790/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	113/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	95/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	100/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	97/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	94/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Schoukroun,Laur

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	5	7	4.19	991/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	4	3	3.50	1378/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1086/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	1382/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	6	3	3	3.27	1281/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	5	2	3.57	1161/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1214/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	773/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1121/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1361/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1429/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1319/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	1353/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1008/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1187/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1036/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1191/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	790/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Schoukroun,Laur

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	113/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	95/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	100/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	97/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	94/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Schoukroun,Laur

Term - Fall 2011

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	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1341/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1158/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1116/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	1220/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	963/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1198/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	6	4	3.53	1310/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1159/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	409/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	845/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	937/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	900/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	462/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	104/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	120/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	114/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	33/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	0	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 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1341/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1158/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1116/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	1220/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	963/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1198/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	6	4	3.53	1310/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	1288/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	696/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	884/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1144/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	981/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	729/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	104/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	120/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	114/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	33/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	0	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 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1341/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1158/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1116/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	1220/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	963/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1198/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	6	4	3.53	1310/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	484/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	179/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	903/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	334/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	503/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	312/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	104/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Fall 2011

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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	120/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	114/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	33/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 14
84-150	0	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 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1033/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1388/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	5	5	1	3.23	1246/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1391/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1111/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1286/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	6	2	3.36	1372/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	2	8	1	3.54	1275/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	748/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	435/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	0	10	4.36	819/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1224/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	686/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1060/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1110/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1217/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	2	4	4	4.20	83/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	2	1	0	6	3.80	134/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	123/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	127/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	115/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1033/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1388/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	5	5	1	3.23	1246/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1391/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1111/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1286/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	6	2	3.36	1372/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	3	5	3	1	3.00	1415/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	1230/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1108/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	4	2	3	3.08	1396/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	3	3	2	3.00	1402/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1057/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1060/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1110/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1217/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	2	4	4	4.20	83/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	2	1	0	6	3.80	134/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	123/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	127/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	115/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A 8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
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				
			? 1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ku,Therese

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1033/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1388/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	5	5	1	3.23	1246/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1391/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1111/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1286/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	6	2	3.36	1372/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	891/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1144/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1379/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1032/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1301/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1276/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1060/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1110/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1217/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ku,Therese

Term - Fall 2011

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	2	4	4	4.20	83/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	2	1	0	6	3.80	134/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	123/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	127/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	115/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1247/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1168/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1112/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1112/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	709/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	798/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	940/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	891/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	648/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1142/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	894/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1094/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	163/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	76/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	108/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	114/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	89/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1247/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1168/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1112/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1112/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	709/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	798/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	940/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	5	3	0	2.91	1443/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1304/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	1253/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	1	4	3	3.14	1387/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	5	2	3.07	1396/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	3	2	0	5	3.70	966/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	76/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	108/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	114/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	89/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode,Tijesun

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1247/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1168/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1112/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1112/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	709/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	798/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	940/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	1304/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1304/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1338/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1191/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1333/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	729/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	76/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode,Tijesun

Term - Fall 2011

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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	108/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	114/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	89/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1421/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1274/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1247/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1382/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1097/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1177/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1159/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	891/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	463/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	903/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	637/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	945/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	518/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1158/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	807/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	151/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	130/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	112/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1421/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1274/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1247/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1382/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1097/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1177/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1159/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	3	0	3.00	1415/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1312/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	1338/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	3	6	1	3.33	1357/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	1353/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	958/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1158/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	807/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	151/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	130/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	112/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Khan,Mohsin

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1421/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1274/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1247/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1382/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1097/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1177/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1159/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1099/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1144/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1330/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1214/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1301/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1210/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1158/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	807/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Khan,Mohsin

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	151/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	130/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	112/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1208/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1086/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	851/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1371/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	919/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1117/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	999/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	718/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	696/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1012/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	1	8	4.08	1042/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	1	9	4.08	1064/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	0	0	0	7	3.80	889/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	987/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1021/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	878/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	125/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	120/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	58/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	63/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	39/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1208/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1086/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	851/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1371/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	919/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1117/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	999/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	4	4	2	0	2.80	1459/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1337/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	1260/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	3	3	1	2.75	1432/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	2	2	3	2.92	1415/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1190/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	987/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1021/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	878/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	125/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	120/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	58/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	63/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	39/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Temburnikar,Kar

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1208/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1086/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	851/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1371/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	919/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1117/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	999/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	605/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	616/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1394/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	334/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	641/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	987/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1021/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	878/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Temburnikar,Kar

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	125/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	120/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	58/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	63/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	39/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 09	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 18
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Temburnikar, Kar		

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	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
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	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1218/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1189/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	756/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1307/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	450/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	742/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	916/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	592/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	147/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	199/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	401/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	503/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	659/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	766/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	781/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

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	2	1	5	4.38	63/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	68/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	59/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	131/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	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 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
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	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1218/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1189/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	756/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1307/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	450/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	742/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	916/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	592/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1203/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	1230/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	675/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1365/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1094/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	587/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	766/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	781/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

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	2	1	5	4.38	63/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	68/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	59/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	131/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	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 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
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	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1218/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1189/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	756/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1307/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	450/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	742/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	916/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	592/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1045/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	712/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	991/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	462/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	766/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	781/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

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	2	1	5	4.38	63/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	68/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	59/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	131/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	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 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1322/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1168/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1147/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	4	2	3	3.42	1367/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1316/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1156/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	999/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1068/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	1070/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	1326/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1075/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1293/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	619/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	135/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	142/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	136/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	0	5	1	6	3.64	142/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	125/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1322/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1168/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1147/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	4	2	3	3.42	1367/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1316/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1156/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	999/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	5	4	1	3.15	1396/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	7	3	3	3.57	1379/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	1353/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1387/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	4	2	3.07	1396/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	871/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	135/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	142/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	136/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	0	5	1	6	3.64	142/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	125/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Shukla,Brahmi

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1322/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1168/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1147/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	4	2	3	3.42	1367/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1316/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1156/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	999/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	6	2	3	3.46	1301/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1402/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	5	3	1	3.17	1457/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1319/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	3	3	3.25	1370/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	987/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Shukla,Brahmi

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	135/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	142/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	136/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	0	5	1	6	3.64	142/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	125/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	9	4.50	607/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	681/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	666/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	821/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	675/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	625/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	529/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	457/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	463/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	622/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	569/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	756/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	528/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	1032/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1012/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1034/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	618/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	69/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	50/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	41/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	46/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.77
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	17/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	9	4.50	607/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	681/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	666/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	821/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	675/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	625/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	529/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	7	6	0	3.20	1384/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1320/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	1096/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	0	4	3	5	3.31	1361/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	1265/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	871/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	1032/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1012/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1034/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	618/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	69/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	50/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	41/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	46/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.77
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	17/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arthur,John

Term - Fall 2011

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	6	9	4.50	607/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	681/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	666/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	821/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	675/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	625/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	529/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	232/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	409/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1048/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	361/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	342/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	110/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	1032/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1012/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1034/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	618/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arthur,John

Term - Fall 2011

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	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	69/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	50/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	41/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	46/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.77
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	17/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arthur,John

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	884/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	912/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	939/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	842/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1125/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	843/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	681/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	10	5	4.19	738/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	251/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	779/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	569/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	888/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	729/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	39/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	70/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	28/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	29/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	884/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	912/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	939/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	842/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1125/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	843/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	681/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	3	6	4	0	2.80	1459/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1296/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	1096/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	5	4	3	3.25	1370/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	5	3	3.38	1345/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	830/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	39/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	70/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	28/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	29/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ku,Therese

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	884/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	912/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	939/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	842/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1125/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	843/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	681/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	849/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	696/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1195/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	877/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	1155/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	871/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ku,Therese

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	39/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	70/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	28/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	29/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	2	2	10	3	3.82	1265/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1200/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1215/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1312/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1064/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	6	5	2	3.57	1161/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	4	1	3	4	2.82	1459/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	2.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	4	3	3.60	1247/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	1144/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	1195/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1046/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	1311/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	2.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	4	1	6	3.64	997/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	135/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	110/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	2	0	10	4.29	98/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	110/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	2	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	2	2	10	3	3.82	1265/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1200/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1215/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1312/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1064/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	6	5	2	3.57	1161/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	4	1	3	4	2.82	1459/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	2.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	3	5	3	0	2.47	1485/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	8	3	1	3.00	1437/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	1394/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	5	5	2	0	2.40	1448/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	8	1	3	2	1	2.13	1452/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	2.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	3	4	1	1	2.50	1281/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	135/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	110/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	2	0	10	4.29	98/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	110/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	2	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	2	2	10	3	3.82	1265/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1200/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1215/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1312/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1064/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	6	5	2	3.57	1161/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	4	1	3	4	2.82	1459/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	2.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	1259/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1382/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1429/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1274/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	6	2	1	3.08	1395/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	2.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Fall 2011

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														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	135/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	110/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	2	0	10	4.29	98/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	110/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 14
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Fall 2011

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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	2	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1118/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1329/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1201/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1267/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1187/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1236/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1318/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1174/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	1055/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1366/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	996/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1094/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1247/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	97/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	50/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	70/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	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				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1118/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1329/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1201/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1267/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1187/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1236/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1318/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	4	4	0	3.20	1384/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1353/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1366/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	6	2	1	3.00	1400/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	4	2	3.23	1375/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	3	2	2	0	2.63	1272/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	97/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	50/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	70/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	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				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Schoukroun,Laur

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1118/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1329/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1201/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1267/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1187/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1236/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1318/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1099/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1230/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	1376/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1162/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	1171/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 15
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Schoukroun,Laur

Term - Fall 2011

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	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	97/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	79/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	50/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	70/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	79/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.14

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	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				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	7	5	4.06	1082/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1047/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	887/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	975/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	893/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	993/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	2	7	3.88	1125/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1022/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	1046/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	1150/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	9	5	4.13	1015/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1147/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	950/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	3	4	6	4.23	78/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	105/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	86/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	118/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	44/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.46

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	7	5	4.06	1082/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1047/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	887/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	975/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	893/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	993/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	2	7	3.88	1125/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1415/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	1207/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	1334/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	5	2	3	3	3.00	1400/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	3	4	3.20	1382/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	3	1	1	4	3.18	1178/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	3	4	6	4.23	78/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	105/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	86/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	118/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	44/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.46

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arthur,John

Term - Fall 2011

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	4	7	5	4.06	1082/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1047/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	887/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	975/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	893/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	993/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	2	7	3.88	1125/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	90/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	321/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	727/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	321/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	566/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	635/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 16
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arthur,John

Term - Fall 2011

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	3	4	6	4.23	78/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	105/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	86/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	118/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	44/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.46

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 17
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	8	8	4.50	607/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	893/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	4	4.06	944/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	906/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	560/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	937/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	893/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	652/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	11	2	3.94	982/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	463/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	903/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	723/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	788/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	288/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 17
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	1	8	4.89	12/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	31/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	77/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	33/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 17	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 18
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Perks,Harry M		

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	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	10 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
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
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 17
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	8	8	4.50	607/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	893/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	4	4.06	944/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	906/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	560/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	937/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	893/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	652/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	4	6	2	3.47	1301/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	984/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	701/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1265/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	945/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	729/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 17
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	1	8	4.89	12/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	31/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	77/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	33/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 17	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 18
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Ptaszek, Marcin		

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	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	10 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
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
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 17
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Fall 2011

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	8	8	4.50	607/1520	4.02	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	893/1520	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	4	4.06	944/1291	3.80	3.85	4.33	4.32	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	906/1483	3.70	3.72	4.23	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	560/1417	3.82	3.77	4.08	4.07	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	937/1405	3.75	3.66	4.12	4.13	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	893/1504	3.79	3.88	4.16	4.15	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	652/1519	4.96	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	324/1495	3.68	3.72	4.11	4.07	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1459	4.21	4.22	4.47	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	962/1460	4.45	4.42	4.74	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	163/1455	3.87	3.97	4.32	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	200/1456	3.78	3.89	4.34	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	145/1316	3.80	3.81	4.03	4.08	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1243	3.49	3.67	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	3.88	4.00	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1236	3.76	3.77	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/889	3.48	3.71	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 17
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	1	8	4.89	12/164	4.10	4.13	4.15	4.12	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	31/165	4.16	4.25	4.19	4.15	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	77/160	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.47	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/158	4.40	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	33/150	4.03	3.96	4.05	3.98	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 17
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Fall 2011

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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	10 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
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
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 405L 01
Title:	Adv Inorg Chem Lab
Instructor:	Onuta,Marie-Chr

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

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	2	5	4.71	335/1520	4.71	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1520	4.71	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	756/1291	4.33	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	493/1483	4.50	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1348/1417	3.00	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1405	4.83	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	715/1504	4.29	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	899/1519	4.71	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	568/1495	3.75	3.72	4.11	4.21	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.22	4.47	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	675/1460	4.86	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1455	5.00	3.97	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1456	4.86	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	401/1316	3.70	3.81	4.03	4.12	3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	33/164	4.67	4.13	4.15	4.36	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	31/165	4.67	4.25	4.19	4.23	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	149/160	3.83	4.51	4.45	4.25	3.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	33/158	4.83	4.37	4.36	4.49	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 8
Title: Adv Inorg Chem Lab		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Onuta,Marie-Chr		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	108/150	3.67	3.96	4.05	3.93	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	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 405L 01
Title:	Adv Inorg Chem Lab
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

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	2	5	4.71	335/1520	4.71	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1520	4.71	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	756/1291	4.33	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	493/1483	4.50	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1348/1417	3.00	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1405	4.83	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	715/1504	4.29	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	899/1519	4.71	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1393/1495	3.75	3.72	4.11	4.21	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1459	5.00	4.22	4.47	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1460	4.86	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1455	5.00	3.97	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1456	4.86	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1210/1316	3.70	3.81	4.03	4.12	3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	33/164	4.67	4.13	4.15	4.36	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	31/165	4.67	4.25	4.19	4.23	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	149/160	3.83	4.51	4.45	4.25	3.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	33/158	4.83	4.37	4.36	4.49	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 405L 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 8
Title: Adv Inorg Chem Lab		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Sesmero,Ester		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	108/150	3.67	3.96	4.05	3.93	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	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 420 1
Title:	Comupter Appl In Chem
Instructor:	Johnson,Bruce A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	1	6	6	4.38	778/1520	4.38	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	2	5	3.69	1306/1520	3.69	3.88	4.27	4.32	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.85	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	778/1483	4.27	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1139/1417	3.60	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1405	4.83	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1150/1504	3.85	3.88	4.16	4.21	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1097/1519	4.54	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	9	2	4.00	891/1495	4.00	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	8	1	3.62	1373/1459	3.62	4.22	4.47	4.54	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	701/1460	4.85	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1289/1455	3.62	3.97	4.32	4.37	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	900/1456	4.31	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	145/1316	4.75	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 420 1
Title:	Computer Appl In Chem
Instructor:	Johnson,Bruce A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	22
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.49	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 435 1
Title:	Cpx Carbohydrates
Instructor:	Bush,C A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	5

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	1	3	4.40	755/1520	4.40	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	723/1520	4.40	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	232/1291	4.80	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	493/1483	4.50	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	362/1417	4.50	3.77	4.08	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1405	****	3.66	4.12	4.25	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	803/1504	4.20	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	718/1495	4.20	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	712/1459	4.60	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.42	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1455	4.60	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1456	4.60	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 435 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 7
Title: Cpx Carbohydrates		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Bush,C A		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Karpel,R L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	157
Questionnaires:	71

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	2	6	8	22	30	4.06	1088/1520	4.06	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	3	7	16	25	15	3.64	1333/1520	3.64	3.88	4.27	4.32	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	5	5	14	24	19	3.70	1121/1291	3.70	3.85	4.33	4.38	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	20	3	3	7	10	23	4.02	1000/1483	4.02	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.02
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	6	2	0	8	18	30	4.28	596/1417	4.28	3.77	4.08	4.12	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	17	3	2	7	14	21	4.02	833/1405	4.02	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.02
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	6	10	22	25	4.00	999/1504	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	64	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	5	24	28	6	3.48	1297/1495	3.52	3.72	4.11	4.21	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	6	7	20	33	4.21	1124/1459	4.22	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	4	17	43	4.53	1172/1460	4.31	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	9	13	19	22	3.73	1253/1455	3.78	3.97	4.32	4.37	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	6	11	13	29	3.82	1212/1456	3.79	3.89	4.34	4.41	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	6	3	11	13	26	3.85	865/1316	3.98	3.81	4.03	4.12	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	56	0	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	55	0	0	0	6	3	7	4.06	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	56	9	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Karpel,R L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	157
Questionnaires:	71

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	68	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	3.93	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	69	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.04	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.99	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	3.43	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.06	2.94	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Karpel,R L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	157
Questionnaires:	71

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	68	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	33	Required for Majors	56	Graduate	3	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	68	Non-major	63
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	21	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	157
Questionnaires:	71

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	2	6	8	22	30	4.06	1088/1520	4.06	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	3	7	16	25	15	3.64	1333/1520	3.64	3.88	4.27	4.32	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	5	5	14	24	19	3.70	1121/1291	3.70	3.85	4.33	4.38	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	20	3	3	7	10	23	4.02	1000/1483	4.02	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.02
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	6	2	0	8	18	30	4.28	596/1417	4.28	3.77	4.08	4.12	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	17	3	2	7	14	21	4.02	833/1405	4.02	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.02
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	6	10	22	25	4.00	999/1504	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	64	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	4	27	22	10	3.56	1263/1495	3.52	3.72	4.11	4.21	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	3	7	23	30	4.22	1124/1459	4.22	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	4	12	14	32	4.09	1377/1460	4.31	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	7	9	26	19	3.84	1196/1455	3.78	3.97	4.32	4.37	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	6	12	12	27	3.76	1231/1456	3.79	3.89	4.34	4.41	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	3	1	10	14	27	4.11	668/1316	3.98	3.81	4.03	4.12	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	56	0	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	55	0	0	0	6	3	7	4.06	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	56	9	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	157
Questionnaires:	71

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	68	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	4.13	4.15	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.51	4.45	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.37	4.36	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	3.96	4.05	3.93	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	69	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.04	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.99	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	3.43	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.06	2.94	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem I
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	157
Questionnaires:	71

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	68	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	33	Required for Majors	56	Graduate	3	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	68	Non-major	63
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	21	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
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	0	2	7	5	4.21	964/1520	4.23	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	388/1520	4.51	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	666/1291	4.59	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	3	3.50	1334/1483	3.75	3.72	4.23	4.33	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1253/1417	3.37	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	0	7	2	3.46	1215/1405	3.73	3.66	4.12	4.25	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1310/1504	3.83	3.88	4.16	4.21	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1163/1519	4.32	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	232/1495	3.90	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	159/1459	4.22	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	435/1460	4.28	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	321/1455	4.09	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	465/1456	3.93	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	347/1316	4.37	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	405/1243	4.50	3.67	4.17	4.42	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1241	4.25	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
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	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	12/164	4.44	4.13	4.15	4.36	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	47/165	4.61	4.25	4.19	4.23	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	77/160	4.44	4.51	4.45	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	44/158	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.49	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	47/150	3.68	3.96	4.05	3.93	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
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	0	2	7	5	4.21	964/1520	4.23	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	388/1520	4.51	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	666/1291	4.59	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	3	3.50	1334/1483	3.75	3.72	4.23	4.33	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1253/1417	3.37	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	0	7	2	3.46	1215/1405	3.73	3.66	4.12	4.25	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1310/1504	3.83	3.88	4.16	4.21	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1163/1519	4.32	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1181/1495	3.90	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1093/1459	4.22	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1142/1460	4.28	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	761/1455	4.09	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1203/1456	3.93	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1316	4.37	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	405/1243	4.50	3.67	4.17	4.42	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1241	4.25	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Neal, Jacob

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
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	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	12/164	4.44	4.13	4.15	4.36	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	47/165	4.61	4.25	4.19	4.23	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	77/160	4.44	4.51	4.45	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	44/158	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.49	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	47/150	3.68	3.96	4.05	3.93	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate 0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 14	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 2	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	0			
			? 4					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
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	2	5	8	4.25	924/1520	4.23	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	760/1520	4.51	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	290/1291	4.59	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	1010/1483	3.75	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1225/1417	3.37	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	843/1405	3.73	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	9	4.13	893/1504	3.83	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1360/1519	4.32	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	484/1495	3.90	3.72	4.11	4.21	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	584/1459	4.22	4.22	4.47	4.54	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1096/1460	4.28	4.42	4.74	4.78	3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	723/1455	4.09	3.97	4.32	4.37	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	756/1456	3.93	3.89	4.34	4.41	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	518/1316	4.37	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1243	4.50	3.67	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	4.25	4.00	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	113/164	4.44	4.13	4.15	4.36	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
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	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	31/165	4.61	4.25	4.19	4.23	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	114/160	4.44	4.51	4.45	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	94/158	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.49	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	143/150	3.68	3.96	4.05	3.93	2.92
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Brown,Jodian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
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	2	5	8	4.25	924/1520	4.23	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	760/1520	4.51	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	290/1291	4.59	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	1010/1483	3.75	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1225/1417	3.37	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	843/1405	3.73	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	9	4.13	893/1504	3.83	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1360/1519	4.32	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	2	7	2	1	2.86	1451/1495	3.90	3.72	4.11	4.21	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1437/1459	4.22	4.22	4.47	4.54	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1459/1460	4.28	4.42	4.74	4.78	3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1432/1455	4.09	3.97	4.32	4.37	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1432/1456	3.93	3.89	4.34	4.41	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1316	4.37	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1243	4.50	3.67	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	4.25	4.00	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	113/164	4.44	4.13	4.15	4.36	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Brown,Jodian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
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	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	31/165	4.61	4.25	4.19	4.23	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	114/160	4.44	4.51	4.45	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	94/158	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.49	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	143/150	3.68	3.96	4.05	3.93	2.92
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 450 1
Title:	Chem Hetero Compds
Instructor:	Radtke,Katherin

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	28

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	7	17	4.46	666/1520	4.46	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	294/1520	4.71	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	267/1291	4.78	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	2	8	14	4.31	747/1483	4.31	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	6	1	7	5	3.13	1321/1417	3.13	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	3	7	12	4.21	708/1405	4.21	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	0	1	23	4.84	119/1504	4.84	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	1024/1519	4.60	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	254/1495	4.62	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	445/1459	4.76	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	435/1460	4.92	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	614/1455	4.52	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	315/1456	4.80	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	651/1316	4.13	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 450 1
Title:	Chem Hetero Compds
Instructor:	Radtke,Katherin

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	28

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	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	4.25	4.19	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 451 1
Title:	Mech Of Organic Reaction
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	34
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	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	581/1520	4.52	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	865/1520	4.29	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	954/1291	4.05	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	906/1483	4.15	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	9	5	6	3.76	1034/1417	3.76	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	977/1405	3.88	3.66	4.12	4.25	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	8	6	3.77	1202/1504	3.77	3.88	4.16	4.21	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	16	1	3.82	1497/1519	3.82	4.80	4.70	4.70	3.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	695/1495	4.22	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	664/1459	4.64	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	779/1460	4.82	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	865/1455	4.32	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	13	4.23	972/1456	4.23	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1032/1243	3.57	3.67	4.17	4.42	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	922/1241	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	781/1236	4.33	3.77	4.40	4.64	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/889	****	3.71	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 451 1
Title:	Mech Of Organic Reaction
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	22

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	7	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 470 01
Title:	Toxicological Chemistry
Instructor:	Fishbein,James

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	29

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	25	4.86	176/1520	4.86	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	16	4.38	760/1520	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	462/1291	4.59	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	16	4.38	669/1483	4.38	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	5	7	12	4.00	803/1417	4.00	3.77	4.08	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	12	9	4.00	843/1405	4.00	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	8	13	4.14	882/1504	4.14	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	6	4.21	1349/1519	4.21	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	9	13	4.23	684/1495	4.23	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	356/1459	4.81	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	675/1460	4.85	4.42	4.74	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	13	13	4.41	761/1455	4.41	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	223/1456	4.89	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	2	2	2	0	6	3.50	1057/1316	3.50	3.81	4.03	4.12	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1243	****	3.67	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1241	****	4.00	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 470 01
Title:	Toxicological Chemistry
Instructor:	Fishbein,James

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1236	****	3.77	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 1
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Liebman,Joel F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	6
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	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	838/1520	4.65	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1420/1520	4.14	3.88	4.27	4.32	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1010/1483	4.36	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1383/1417	3.51	3.77	4.08	4.12	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1331/1405	3.77	3.66	4.12	4.25	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1432/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.21	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1519	4.35	4.80	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1321/1495	4.26	3.72	4.11	4.21	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1456/1459	4.09	4.22	4.47	4.54	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.42	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1424/1455	4.06	3.97	4.32	4.37	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1203/1456	4.53	3.89	4.34	4.41	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	298/1243	4.72	3.67	4.17	4.42	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1241	4.89	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	302/1236	4.89	3.77	4.40	4.64	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 490 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 6
Title: Special Topics In Chem		Questionnaires: 6
Instructor: Liebman,Joel F		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	186/889	4.75	3.71	4.02	4.26	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 2
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Geddes,Christop

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

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	6	4.71	335/1520	4.65	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1520	4.14	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1291	4.69	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1483	4.36	3.72	4.23	4.33	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	803/1417	3.51	3.77	4.08	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1405	3.77	3.66	4.12	4.25	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	362/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1517/1519	4.35	4.80	4.70	4.70	3.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1495	4.26	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1459	4.09	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.42	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	387/1455	4.06	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1456	4.53	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	169/1316	4.81	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	405/1243	4.72	3.67	4.17	4.42	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1241	4.89	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	302/1236	4.89	3.77	4.40	4.64	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 490 2	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 7
Title: Special Topics In Chem		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Geddes,Christop		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	4.75	3.71	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 3
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	White,Ryan Jeff

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
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	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	140/1520	4.65	3.95	4.31	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	772/1520	4.14	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	504/1291	4.69	3.85	4.33	4.38	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	253/1483	4.36	3.72	4.23	4.33	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1070/1417	3.51	3.77	4.08	4.12	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	344/1405	3.77	3.66	4.12	4.25	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	924/1504	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	990/1519	4.35	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	239/1495	4.26	3.72	4.11	4.21	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	199/1459	4.09	4.22	4.47	4.54	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.42	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	487/1455	4.06	3.97	4.32	4.37	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	200/1456	4.53	3.89	4.34	4.41	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	80/1316	4.81	3.81	4.03	4.12	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1243	4.72	3.67	4.17	4.42	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.89	4.00	4.33	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	4.89	3.77	4.40	4.64	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 3
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	White,Ryan Jeff

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/889	4.75	3.71	4.02	4.26	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						