

Course-Section: CHEM 100 01
 Title The Chemical World
 Instructor: Liebman, Joel F
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 208
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	5	4	3.28	1377/1447	3.28	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	6	5	3.56	1304/1447	3.56	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1062/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	5	6	3.67	1203/1402	3.67	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	0	6	1	3	2.80	1325/1358	2.80	3.86	4.11	4.03	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	9	3.94	870/1316	3.94	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	4	2	2	4	2.76	1377/1427	2.76	4.00	4.19	4.24	2.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	6	0	3.29	1305/1434	3.29	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	6	3	5	3.53	1302/1387	3.53	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	732/1387	4.82	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	7	2	6	3.65	1225/1386	3.65	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1185/1380	3.71	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/1193	****	3.77	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1058/1172	3.25	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	817/1182	4.13	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1170	4.63	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 209
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	8	4	14	16	3.84	1214/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	7	15	18	4.09	999/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	7	13	17	3.82	1041/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	3	7	9	13	3.91	1076/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	13	14	8	3.62	1118/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	4	4	8	7	6	3.24	1225/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	9	9	22	4.14	890/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	3	37	4.77	819/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	1	9	11	7	3.86	1017/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	5	3	32	4.52	769/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	3	6	31	4.61	1055/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	2	7	11	20	4.15	971/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	3	8	27	4.28	868/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	3	1	9	9	15	3.86	780/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	1	9	11	14	3.70	904/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	7	10	17	3.88	957/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	14	9	10	3.53	1062/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	5	6	11	13	3.83	547/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	26
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	B 14	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 7	Under-grad	46
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 2	Non-major	45
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 210
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	8	4	14	16	3.84	1214/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	7	15	18	4.09	999/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	7	13	17	3.82	1041/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	3	7	9	13	3.91	1076/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	13	14	8	3.62	1118/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	4	4	8	7	6	3.24	1225/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	9	9	22	4.14	890/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	3	37	4.77	819/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	1	12	10	3	3.58	1203/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	2	6	2	19	4.20	1085/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	0	4	5	19	4.41	1197/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	2	2	6	7	13	3.90	1128/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	4	3	6	14	3.80	1153/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	2	2	1	8	5	9	3.72	861/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	1	9	11	14	3.70	904/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	7	10	17	3.88	957/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	14	9	10	3.53	1062/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	5	6	11	13	3.83	547/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	26
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 46
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Sladick,Kelli (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 211
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	8	4	14	16	3.84	1214/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	7	15	18	4.09	999/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	7	13	17	3.82	1041/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	3	7	9	13	3.91	1076/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	13	14	8	3.62	1118/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	4	4	8	7	6	3.24	1225/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	9	9	22	4.14	890/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	3	37	4.77	819/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	2	0	1	8	9	2	3.60	1188/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	881/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	1214/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1164/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	1	0	4	7	3.93	1089/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	2	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	****/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	1	9	11	14	3.70	904/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	7	10	17	3.88	957/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	14	9	10	3.53	1062/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	5	6	11	13	3.83	547/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	26
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 46
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 212
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	8	4	14	16	3.84	1214/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	7	15	18	4.09	999/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	7	13	17	3.82	1041/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	3	7	9	13	3.91	1076/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	13	14	8	3.62	1118/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	4	4	8	7	6	3.24	1225/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	9	9	22	4.14	890/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	3	37	4.77	819/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	2	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	744/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	881/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	1185/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	895/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	815/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	2	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	****/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	1	9	11	14	3.70	904/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	7	10	17	3.88	957/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	1	14	9	10	3.53	1062/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	5	6	11	13	3.83	547/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A 14	Required for Majors 26	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B 14			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 7	General 7	Under-grad 46	Non-major 45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 2			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 213
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	17	18	15	3.83	1214/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	9	26	13	3.89	1154/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	7	10	15	15	3.54	1134/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	2	8	9	9	8	3.36	1298/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	1	5	10	10	17	3.86	945/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	33	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1111/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	4	12	14	19	3.92	1055/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	6	43	4.82	700/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	2	3	18	15	3	3.34	1290/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	7	13	28	4.44	870/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	4	9	32	4.54	1107/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	3	13	13	18	3.86	1151/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	3	4	4	12	25	4.08	1003/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	3	4	12	8	18	3.76	843/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	3	12	11	13	3.55	982/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	4	11	8	20	3.95	898/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	6	10	11	13	3.52	1062/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	4	7	7	17	3.67	609/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	19	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	45
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 23		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 11	C 11	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 214
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	17	18	15	3.83	1214/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	9	26	13	3.89	1154/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	7	10	15	15	3.54	1134/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	2	8	9	9	8	3.36	1298/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	1	5	10	10	17	3.86	945/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	33	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1111/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	4	12	14	19	3.92	1055/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	6	43	4.82	700/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	4	8	9	8	3	2.94	1371/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	1	5	6	12	4.08	1150/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	1	1	3	2	16	4.35	1225/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	3	2	6	6	6	3.43	1275/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	5	2	4	2	9	3.36	1278/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	4	6	1	2	3	7	3.21	1048/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	3	12	11	13	3.55	982/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	4	11	8	20	3.95	898/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	6	10	11	13	3.52	1062/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	4	7	7	17	3.67	609/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 45	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 23			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	11	C 11	General 2	Under-grad 54	Non-major 54
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 3			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Fedorowski,Jenn (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 215
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	17	18	15	3.83	1214/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	9	26	13	3.89	1154/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	7	10	15	15	3.54	1134/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	2	8	9	9	8	3.36	1298/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	1	5	10	10	17	3.86	945/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	33	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1111/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	4	12	14	19	3.92	1055/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	6	43	4.82	700/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	2	0	2	4	14	8	4.00	849/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	1176/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	2	3	1	13	4.32	1237/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	37	0	0	1	6	6	4	3.76	1188/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	6	1	7	3.93	1081/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	39	4	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	****/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	3	12	11	13	3.55	982/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	4	11	8	20	3.95	898/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	6	10	11	13	3.52	1062/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	4	7	7	17	3.67	609/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	19	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	45
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 23		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 11	C 11	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 216
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	17	18	15	3.83	1214/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	9	26	13	3.89	1154/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	7	10	15	15	3.54	1134/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	2	8	9	9	8	3.36	1298/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	1	5	10	10	17	3.86	945/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	33	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1111/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	4	12	14	19	3.92	1055/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	6	43	4.82	700/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	1	0	2	12	14	4.31	565/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1105/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	982/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1026/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	978/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	39	4	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	****/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	3	12	11	13	3.55	982/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	4	11	8	20	3.95	898/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	6	10	11	13	3.52	1062/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	5	4	7	7	17	3.67	609/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	19	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	45
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 23		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 11	C 11	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 101 04
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 217
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	9	12	17	4.07	1022/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	15	15	4.05	1023/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	13	8	16	4.03	914/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	6	13	13	4.09	923/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	6	11	14	3.97	834/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	1	5	8	10	4.00	812/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	10	22	4.30	716/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	33	4.75	836/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	2	14	5	8	3.66	1156/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	11	25	4.56	712/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	946/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	6	12	19	4.18	945/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	8	23	4.25	887/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	7	9	18	4.11	612/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	7	5	16	4.00	710/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	4	9	14	3.94	915/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	6	11	11	3.84	962/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	3	1	5	9	10	3.79	569/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 9	General 3	Under-grad 41	Non-major 41
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		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 04
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 218
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	9	12	17	4.07	1022/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	15	15	4.05	1023/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	13	8	16	4.03	914/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	6	13	13	4.09	923/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	6	11	14	3.97	834/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	1	5	8	10	4.00	812/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	10	22	4.30	716/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	33	4.75	836/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	1	0	6	12	3	3.73	1110/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	3	0	0	6	19	4.36	951/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	1	0	5	21	4.57	1081/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	0	3	8	14	4.19	936/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	0	2	8	12	4.04	1016/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	0	0	5	8	8	4.14	574/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	7	5	16	4.00	710/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	4	9	14	3.94	915/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	6	11	11	3.84	962/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	3	1	5	9	10	3.79	569/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		23	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General		3	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
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				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 101 04
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Fedorowski,Jenn (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 219
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	9	12	17	4.07	1022/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	15	15	4.05	1023/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	13	8	16	4.03	914/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	6	13	13	4.09	923/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	6	11	14	3.97	834/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	1	5	8	10	4.00	812/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	10	22	4.30	716/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	33	4.75	836/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	431/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	398/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	814/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	405/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	689/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	3	2	1	2	2	8	3.87	780/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	7	5	16	4.00	710/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	4	9	14	3.94	915/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	6	11	11	3.84	962/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	3	1	5	9	10	3.79	569/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		23	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General		3	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
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				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 101 04
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 220
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	9	12	17	4.07	1022/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	15	15	4.05	1023/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	13	8	16	4.03	914/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	6	13	13	4.09	923/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	6	11	14	3.97	834/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	1	5	8	10	4.00	812/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	10	22	4.30	716/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	33	4.75	836/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	516/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	536/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	889/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	539/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	791/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	3	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	855/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	7	5	16	4.00	710/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	4	9	14	3.94	915/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	6	11	11	3.84	962/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	3	1	5	9	10	3.79	569/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 9	General 3	Under-grad 41	Non-major 41
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		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 05
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 221
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	5	10	21	21	3.97	1098/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	13	18	20	3.88	1161/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	16	11	21	3.66	1099/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	12	15	11	3.58	1238/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	4	14	12	16	3.64	1097/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	3	5	9	7	10	3.47	1145/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	4	13	12	24	3.95	1034/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	1	0	3	48	4.81	727/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	0	2	10	25	2	3.69	1131/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	6	13	35	4.37	941/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	4	16	35	4.44	1185/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	5	11	17	18	3.78	1184/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	3	9	15	23	4.10	1000/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	4	2	12	11	22	3.88	769/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	2	9	16	15	3.56	974/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	5	12	11	21	3.92	924/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	2	13	17	12	3.59	1035/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	6	2	7	7	23	3.87	532/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 40	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 12			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C 15	General 3	Under-grad 59	Non-major 57
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 3			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 05
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 222
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	5	10	21	21	3.97	1098/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	13	18	20	3.88	1161/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	16	11	21	3.66	1099/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	12	15	11	3.58	1238/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	4	14	12	16	3.64	1097/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	3	5	9	7	10	3.47	1145/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	4	13	12	24	3.95	1034/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	1	0	3	48	4.81	727/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	2	0	2	15	16	2	3.51	1233/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	4	10	20	4.47	829/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	1	11	22	4.62	1042/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	1	8	14	11	4.03	1038/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	6	12	13	4.16	965/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	1	1	3	7	3	16	4.00	652/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	2	9	16	15	3.56	974/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	5	12	11	21	3.92	924/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	2	13	17	12	3.59	1035/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	6	2	7	7	23	3.87	532/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 40
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 12	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C 15	General 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 59
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 57
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	Electives 1
					Other 0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 101 05
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Fedorowski,Jenn (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 223
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	5	10	21	21	3.97	1098/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	13	18	20	3.88	1161/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	16	11	21	3.66	1099/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	12	15	11	3.58	1238/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	4	14	12	16	3.64	1097/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	3	5	9	7	10	3.47	1145/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	4	13	12	24	3.95	1034/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	1	0	3	48	4.81	727/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	2	0	0	5	20	7	4.06	817/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	42	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1160/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	37	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	1237/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	43	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	988/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	990/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	43	2	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	****/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	2	9	16	15	3.56	974/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	5	12	11	21	3.92	924/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	2	13	17	12	3.59	1035/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	6	2	7	7	23	3.87	532/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 40
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 12	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C 15	General 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 59
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 57
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	Electives 1
					Other 0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 101 05
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Polasani,Shavan (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 224
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	5	10	21	21	3.97	1098/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	13	18	20	3.88	1161/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	16	11	21	3.66	1099/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	12	15	11	3.58	1238/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	4	14	12	16	3.64	1097/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	3	5	9	7	10	3.47	1145/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	4	13	12	24	3.95	1034/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	1	0	3	48	4.81	727/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	1	0	0	4	21	8	4.12	775/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	41	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	1233/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	36	0	1	0	4	6	12	4.22	1276/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1164/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1013/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	43	2	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	****/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	8	2	9	16	15	3.56	974/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	5	12	11	21	3.92	924/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	5	2	13	17	12	3.59	1035/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	6	2	7	7	23	3.87	532/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 40
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 12	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C 15	General 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 59
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 57
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	Electives 1
					Other 0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	3	10	15	13	3.61	1310/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	10	17	11	3.59	1293/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	3	5	10	10	16	3.70	1083/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	5	5	6	11	6	3.24	1332/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	6	7	9	14	3.51	1165/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	4	1	5	8	4	3.32	1208/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	9	10	21	4.02	959/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	1	0	1	39	4.90	485/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	5	4	8	14	5	3.28	1307/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	9	8	25	4.25	1039/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	3	7	7	26	4.23	1272/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	5	9	11	15	3.58	1243/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	3	5	11	17	3.78	1159/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	4	3	11	7	17	3.71	867/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	9	6	4	11	3.08	1084/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	7	2	4	11	12	3.53	1073/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	6	2	6	7	14	3.60	1032/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	4	5	6	8	10	3.45	669/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 1	A 16	Required for Majors 39	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 47 Non-major 46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	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	1
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 06
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 226
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	3	10	15	13	3.61	1310/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	10	17	11	3.59	1293/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	3	5	10	10	16	3.70	1083/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	5	5	6	11	6	3.24	1332/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	6	7	9	14	3.51	1165/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	4	1	5	8	4	3.32	1208/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	9	10	21	4.02	959/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	1	0	1	39	4.90	485/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	3	3	12	12	2	3.22	1322/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	1	5	6	16	4.10	1144/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	2	0	3	7	17	4.28	1252/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	1	9	5	10	3.74	1195/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	2	2	5	4	7	5	3.35	1282/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	4	4	4	3	8	6	3.32	1025/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	9	6	4	11	3.08	1084/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	7	2	4	11	12	3.53	1073/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	6	2	6	7	14	3.60	1032/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	4	5	6	8	10	3.45	669/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 1	A 16	Required for Majors 39	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 47 Non-major 46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	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	1
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 06
 Title Prin Of Chemistry I
 Instructor: Polasani,Shavan (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 227
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	3	10	15	13	3.61	1310/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	10	17	11	3.59	1293/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	3	5	10	10	16	3.70	1083/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	5	5	6	11	6	3.24	1332/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	6	7	9	14	3.51	1165/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	4	1	5	8	4	3.32	1208/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	9	10	21	4.02	959/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	1	0	1	39	4.90	485/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	1	5	12	9	4.07	812/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	1063/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	1081/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	784/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	1	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1081/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	2	1	2	4	2	7	3.75	843/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	9	6	4	11	3.08	1084/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	7	2	4	11	12	3.53	1073/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	6	2	6	7	14	3.60	1032/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	4	5	6	8	10	3.45	669/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A 16	Required for Majors 39	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 47	Non-major 46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	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	1
?	1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	10	15	13	3.61	1310/1447	3.86	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	10	17	11	3.59	1293/1447	3.90	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	3	5	10	10	16	3.70	1083/1241	3.75	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	5	5	6	11	6	3.24	1332/1402	3.64	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	6	7	9	14	3.51	1165/1358	3.72	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	4	1	5	8	4	3.32	1208/1316	3.52	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	4	9	10	21	4.02	959/1427	4.07	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	1	0	1	39	4.90	485/1447	4.81	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	0	0	3	14	11	4.29	600/1434	3.81	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	1063/1387	4.31	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	1125/1387	4.48	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	784/1386	4.03	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1030/1380	4.02	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	2	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	916/1193	3.76	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	9	6	4	11	3.08	1084/1172	3.58	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	7	2	4	11	12	3.53	1073/1182	3.84	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	6	2	6	7	14	3.60	1032/1170	3.62	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	4	5	6	8	10	3.45	669/ 800	3.72	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 1	A 16	Required for Majors 39	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 47 Non-major 46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	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	1
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 229
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	11	19	5	3.55	1324/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	18	8	3.71	1247/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	8	6	12	10	3.53	1137/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	5	9	7	4	3.22	1337/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	7	8	9	3.69	1070/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	3	1	4	7	2	3.24	1228/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	13	11	13	3.80	1144/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	1	1	1	1	32	4.72	885/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	1	6	14	7	3.86	1010/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	9	9	21	4.20	1085/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	10	26	4.46	1167/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	10	8	18	3.90	1128/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	10	7	19	4.03	1023/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	4	1	8	7	11	3.65	905/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	3	12	13	3.91	801/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	4	7	20	4.26	732/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	4	5	6	16	3.82	969/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	3	3	2	6	16	3.97	458/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.97
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 229
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 230
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	11	19	5	3.55	1324/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	18	8	3.71	1247/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	8	6	12	10	3.53	1137/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	5	9	7	4	3.22	1337/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	7	8	9	3.69	1070/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	3	1	4	7	2	3.24	1228/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	13	11	13	3.80	1144/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	1	1	1	1	32	4.72	885/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	2	8	12	4	3.69	1131/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	3	9	15	4.32	980/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	2	7	21	4.52	1134/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	3	0	4	3	18	4.18	945/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	7	6	13	4.04	1020/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	616/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	3	12	13	3.91	801/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	4	7	20	4.26	732/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	4	5	6	16	3.82	969/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	3	3	2	6	16	3.97	458/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.97
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 230
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Sladick,Kelli (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 231
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	11	19	5	3.55	1324/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	18	8	3.71	1247/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	8	6	12	10	3.53	1137/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	5	9	7	4	3.22	1337/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	7	8	9	3.69	1070/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	3	1	4	7	2	3.24	1228/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	13	11	13	3.80	1144/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	1	1	1	1	32	4.72	885/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	3	1	1	4	7	3	3.63	1175/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	1092/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	1256/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	1	3	1	9	3.88	1141/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	3	1	3	1	8	3.63	1211/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	7	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	3	12	13	3.91	801/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	4	7	20	4.26	732/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	4	5	6	16	3.82	969/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	3	3	2	6	16	3.97	458/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.97
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Sladick,Kelli (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 231
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 232
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	11	19	5	3.55	1324/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	18	8	3.71	1247/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	8	6	12	10	3.53	1137/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	5	9	7	4	3.22	1337/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	7	8	9	3.69	1070/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	3	1	4	7	2	3.24	1228/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	13	11	13	3.80	1144/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	1	1	1	1	32	4.72	885/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	3	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	849/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	1085/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	1276/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	2	1	2	1	9	3.93	1103/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	5	0	9	3.88	1118/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	7	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	3	12	13	3.91	801/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	4	7	20	4.26	732/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	4	5	6	16	3.82	969/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	3	3	2	6	16	3.97	458/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.97
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Wassink, Sarah (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 232
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 233
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	1249/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	7	8	4.17	938/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	923/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1158/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	529/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1020/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	4	2	4	5	3.35	1306/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	5	7	2	3.67	1150/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	970/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1042/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	997/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	1	5	7	3.82	1143/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	0	3	9	4.13	583/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	463/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1152/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1160/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	137/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	140/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	42/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	73/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	90/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.21
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 233
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Magnanelli, Tim (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 234
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	1249/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	7	8	4.17	938/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	923/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1158/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	529/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1020/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	4	2	4	5	3.35	1306/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	942/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	741/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	758/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	241/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	549/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	463/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1152/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1160/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	137/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	140/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	42/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	73/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	90/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.21
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 02
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Magnanelli, Tim (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 234
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 235
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	16	20	10	3.67	1290/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	15	18	14	3.82	1196/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	11	16	13	7	3.16	1204/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	2	7	15	11	6	3.29	1319/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	2	13	14	12	3.74	1029/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	26	3	5	7	6	2	2.96	1263/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	14	25	4.22	823/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	700/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	3	12	16	7	3.58	1203/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	3	9	14	19	4.09	1150/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	4	4	13	23	4.25	1260/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	5	9	11	19	3.93	1103/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	2	6	7	9	17	3.80	1153/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	12	1	4	11	11	7	3.56	943/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	5	10	14	13	3.64	936/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	10	11	22	4.16	796/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	14	13	14	3.72	998/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.72
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	2	3	8	12	17	3.93	494/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 235
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	52	Non-major	52
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	16	20	10	3.67	1290/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	15	18	14	3.82	1196/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	11	16	13	7	3.16	1204/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	2	7	15	11	6	3.29	1319/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	2	13	14	12	3.74	1029/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	26	3	5	7	6	2	2.96	1263/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	14	25	4.22	823/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	700/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	1	14	17	5	3.70	1125/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	818/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	1143/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	945/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	3	6	6	9	3.88	1118/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	4	2	1	7	4	6	3.55	943/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	5	10	14	13	3.64	936/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	10	11	22	4.16	796/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	14	13	14	3.72	998/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.72
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	2	3	8	12	17	3.93	494/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 236
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	52	Non-major	52
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 237
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	16	20	10	3.67	1290/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	15	18	14	3.82	1196/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	11	16	13	7	3.16	1204/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	2	7	15	11	6	3.29	1319/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	2	13	14	12	3.74	1029/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	26	3	5	7	6	2	2.96	1263/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	14	25	4.22	823/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	700/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	6	0	0	5	17	9	4.13	775/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	1156/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	1	0	2	10	7	4.10	1303/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	2	0	4	4	7	3.82	1164/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1118/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	6	2	2	3	0	4	3.18	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	5	10	14	13	3.64	936/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	10	11	22	4.16	796/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	14	13	14	3.72	998/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.72
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	2	3	8	12	17	3.93	494/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 237
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	52	Non-major	52
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Polasani,Shavan (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 238
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	16	20	10	3.67	1290/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	15	18	14	3.82	1196/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	11	16	13	7	3.16	1204/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	2	7	15	11	6	3.29	1319/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	2	13	14	12	3.74	1029/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	26	3	5	7	6	2	2.96	1263/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	14	25	4.22	823/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	700/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	3	0	0	4	17	14	4.29	600/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	1156/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	1	0	2	10	7	4.10	1303/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	1	0	5	4	8	4.00	1047/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1143/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	6	3	2	3	0	4	3.00	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	5	10	14	13	3.64	936/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	10	11	22	4.16	796/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	14	13	14	3.72	998/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.72
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	2	3	8	12	17	3.93	494/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 03
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Polasani,Shavan (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 238
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	36	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	52	Non-major	52
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 03
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 239
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	10	4.00	1058/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	12	4.04	1029/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	962/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	3	8	6	3.85	1107/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	799/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	4	5	6	3.68	1038/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	2	8	7	3.61	1228/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	8	3	3.67	1150/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	6	11	4.14	1124/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	1107/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	3	8	8	3.86	1146/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	6	5	6	3.45	1258/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	4	10	3.95	705/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	3	1	4	10	4.00	140/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	156/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	3.95
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	78/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	57/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.72
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	102/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		

I	0	Other	1
?	1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	10	4.00	1058/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	12	4.04	1029/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	962/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	3	8	6	3.85	1107/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	799/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	4	5	6	3.68	1038/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	2	8	7	3.61	1228/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	817/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	798/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1222/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	663/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1003/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	3	1	4	10	4.00	140/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	156/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	3.95
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	78/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	57/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.72
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	102/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		

I	0	Other	1
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 04
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 241
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	8	24	16	3.87	1182/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	16	20	15	3.83	1189/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	5	17	17	12	3.65	1099/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	3	12	16	9	3.71	1188/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	4	9	9	21	3.96	858/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	32	0	3	3	6	7	3.89	915/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	14	27	4.21	823/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	1	2	4	6	36	4.51	1072/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	3	10	19	8	3.80	1052/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	8	16	25	4.30	1000/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	4	10	32	4.53	1116/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	8	17	22	4.20	919/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	5	6	11	25	4.13	984/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	3	4	16	5	10	3.39	1002/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	3	10	16	14	3.65	936/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	5	7	12	19	3.85	974/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	11	12	18	3.85	958/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	3	2	8	14	15	3.86	537/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors 43	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 14					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 15	General	2	Under-grad	54	Non-major 52
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 3					

Course-Section: CHEM 102 04
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 242
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	8	24	16	3.87	1182/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	16	20	15	3.83	1189/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	5	17	17	12	3.65	1099/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	3	12	16	9	3.71	1188/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	4	9	9	21	3.96	858/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	32	0	3	3	6	7	3.89	915/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	14	27	4.21	823/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	1	2	4	6	36	4.51	1072/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	3	17	13	6	3.50	1238/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	5	8	27	4.55	727/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	7	31	4.72	904/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	7	13	17	4.21	911/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	2	11	10	11	3.72	1178/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	9	0	1	9	10	10	3.97	694/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	3	10	16	14	3.65	936/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	5	7	12	19	3.85	974/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	11	12	18	3.85	958/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	3	2	8	14	15	3.86	537/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	2	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 04
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 243
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	8	24	16	3.87	1182/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	16	20	15	3.83	1189/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	5	17	17	12	3.65	1099/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	3	12	16	9	3.71	1188/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	4	9	9	21	3.96	858/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	32	0	3	3	6	7	3.89	915/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	14	27	4.21	823/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	1	2	4	6	36	4.51	1072/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	1	5	21	8	4.03	838/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	698/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	732/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	677/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	637/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	6	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	509/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	3	10	16	14	3.65	936/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	5	7	12	19	3.85	974/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	11	12	18	3.85	958/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	3	2	8	14	15	3.86	537/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors 43	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 14					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 15	General	2	Under-grad	54	Non-major 52
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 3					

Course-Section: CHEM 102 04
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Polasani,Shavan (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 244
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	8	24	16	3.87	1182/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	16	20	15	3.83	1189/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	5	17	17	12	3.65	1099/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	3	12	16	9	3.71	1188/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	4	9	9	21	3.96	858/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	32	0	3	3	6	7	3.89	915/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	7	14	27	4.21	823/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	1	2	4	6	36	4.51	1072/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	0	2	20	14	4.33	540/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	566/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	732/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	677/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	434/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	6	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	509/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	3	10	16	14	3.65	936/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	5	7	12	19	3.85	974/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	11	12	18	3.85	958/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	3	2	8	14	15	3.86	537/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors 43	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 14					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 15	General	2	Under-grad	54	Non-major 52
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 3					

Course-Section: CHEM 102 04
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 245
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	6	6	7	2	3.24	1384/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	8	5	3	3.19	1379/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	4	6	3	3	3.60	1116/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	5	6	3	2	2.89	1374/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	4	4	5	2	3.19	1266/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	3	6	3	1	2.56	1296/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	2.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	7	6	3	4	1	2.33	1408/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1223/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	7	6	6	3.71	1270/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	1161/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	5	8	4	3.52	1253/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	6	3	5	4	3.05	1315/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	2.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	831/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1150/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	2	5	0	1	2.60	1170/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	6	0	1	2.70	1156/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	2.70
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	769/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	3	0	4	3	3	3.23	182/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	3.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	169/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	179/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	3.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	168/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	3.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	164/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	3.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 04
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 245
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 04
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Bediako, Bernice (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 246
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	6	6	7	2	3.24	1384/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	8	5	3	3.19	1379/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	4	6	3	3	3.60	1116/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	5	6	3	2	2.89	1374/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	4	4	5	2	3.19	1266/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	3	6	3	1	2.56	1296/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	2.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	7	6	3	4	1	2.33	1408/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	1	9	0	3	3.07	1343/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	5	6	5	2	3.00	1350/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	3	6	8	2	3.35	1371/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	5	7	2	2	2.65	1358/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	5	4	3	2	2.58	1353/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	2.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1077/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1150/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	2	5	0	1	2.60	1170/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	6	0	1	2.70	1156/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	2.70
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	769/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	3	0	4	3	3	3.23	182/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	3.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	169/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	179/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	3.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	168/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	3.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	2	2	3	1	4	3.25	164/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	3.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 04
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Bediako, Bernice (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 246
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 05
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 247
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	17	21	4.15	971/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	19	21	4.25	853/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	8	19	15	3.88	1008/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	5	14	11	4.10	916/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	6	13	18	4.32	540/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	1	0	5	6	10	4.09	763/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	14	26	4.38	620/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	14	31	4.62	1008/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	1	6	25	3	3.86	1017/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	8	16	24	4.33	970/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	12	34	4.67	982/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	12	13	21	4.10	1006/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	11	10	25	4.23	905/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	2	5	11	18	4.00	652/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	6	14	22	4.25	580/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	6	6	29	4.44	604/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	6	12	23	4.28	751/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	0	3	6	28	4.49	206/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.49
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors		42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	17							
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General		1	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	10	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 05
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 248
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	17	21	4.15	971/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	19	21	4.25	853/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	8	19	15	3.88	1008/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	5	14	11	4.10	916/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	6	13	18	4.32	540/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	1	0	5	6	10	4.09	763/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	14	26	4.38	620/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	14	31	4.62	1008/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	1	9	20	4	3.71	1117/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	656/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	982/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	4	5	18	4.43	719/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	7	5	14	4.19	946/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	193/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	6	14	22	4.25	580/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	6	6	29	4.44	604/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	6	12	23	4.28	751/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	0	3	6	28	4.49	206/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.49
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors		42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	17							
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General		1	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	10	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 05
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Polasani,Shavan (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 249
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	17	21	4.15	971/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	19	21	4.25	853/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	8	19	15	3.88	1008/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	5	14	11	4.10	916/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	6	13	18	4.32	540/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	1	0	5	6	10	4.09	763/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	14	26	4.38	620/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	14	31	4.62	1008/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	0	3	20	10	4.21	679/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	829/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	1063/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	316/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	689/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	6	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	349/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	6	14	22	4.25	580/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	6	6	29	4.44	604/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	6	12	23	4.28	751/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	0	3	6	28	4.49	206/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.49
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors		42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	17							
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General		1	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	10	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 05
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 250
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	17	21	4.15	971/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	19	21	4.25	853/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	8	19	15	3.88	1008/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	5	14	11	4.10	916/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	6	13	18	4.32	540/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	1	0	5	6	10	4.09	763/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	14	26	4.38	620/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	14	31	4.62	1008/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	0	4	19	10	4.18	712/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	829/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	1125/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	558/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	791/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	6	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	349/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	6	14	22	4.25	580/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	6	6	29	4.44	604/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	6	12	23	4.28	751/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	0	3	6	28	4.49	206/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.49
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors		42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	17							
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General		1	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	10	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 05
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 251
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1290/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	4	5	3.61	1282/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1021/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1046/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1036/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	1106/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	8	5	3	3.50	1259/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	538/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1137/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	1063/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	1179/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	3	9	3.89	1137/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	4	2	6	3.28	1294/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	652/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1131/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1152/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1124/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	62/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	116/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	58/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	35/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	129/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 05
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 251
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
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						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 05
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Magnanelli, Tim (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 252
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1290/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	4	5	3.61	1282/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1021/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1046/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1036/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	1106/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	8	5	3	3.50	1259/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	538/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	712/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	891/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	1248/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	793/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	965/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	9	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1131/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1152/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1124/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	62/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	116/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	58/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	35/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	129/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 05
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Magnanelli, Tim (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 252
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
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						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 06
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 253
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1032/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	766/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	10	5	4.06	900/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	358/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	799/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	785/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	906/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	9	0	3.56	1208/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	970/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	707/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	847/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	3	9	4.00	1030/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	726/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.05
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	73/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	62/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	75/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	27/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	21/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	15
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0	Under-grad	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Non-major	18
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	0

Course-Section: CHEM 102 06
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Tomney, Matthew (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 254
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1032/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	766/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	10	5	4.06	900/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	358/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	799/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	785/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	906/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	386/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	0	13	4.67	566/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	889/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	366/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	659/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	555/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.05
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	73/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	62/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	75/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	27/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	21/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	15
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0	Under-grad	19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Non-major	18
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	0

Course-Section: CHEM 102 07
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 255
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	11	13	4.06	1027/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	15	4.23	882/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	7	13	8	3.87	1015/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	7	4	8	3.81	1139/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	5	10	6	3.78	1001/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1106/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	5	21	4.42	582/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	948/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	12	9	4.15	744/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	5	22	4.52	783/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	5	23	4.58	1072/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	9	18	4.32	820/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	7	15	4.21	934/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	4	6	8	9	3.81	807/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	3	9	8	3.68	914/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	4	8	9	3.88	957/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	0	4	9	7	3.63	1025/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	3	5	4	10	3.95	467/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 1	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 07
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 256
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	11	13	4.06	1027/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	15	4.23	882/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	7	13	8	3.87	1015/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	7	4	8	3.81	1139/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	5	10	6	3.78	1001/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1106/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	5	21	4.42	582/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	948/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	9	12	2	3.63	1175/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	641/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	1063/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	895/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	5	3	4	6	3.47	1253/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	1	1	9	4	3	3.39	1005/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	3	9	8	3.68	914/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	4	8	9	3.88	957/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	0	4	9	7	3.63	1025/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	3	5	4	10	3.95	467/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 1	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 07
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Fedorowski,Jenn (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 257
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	11	13	4.06	1027/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	15	4.23	882/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	7	13	8	3.87	1015/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	7	4	8	3.81	1139/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	5	10	6	3.78	1001/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1106/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	5	21	4.42	582/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	948/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	8	11	5	3.88	1003/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	1092/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	1143/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1141/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1089/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	3	2	5	3	1	2.79	1132/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	3	9	8	3.68	914/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	4	8	9	3.88	957/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	0	4	9	7	3.63	1025/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	3	5	4	10	3.95	467/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	25
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 1	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 07
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 258
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	11	13	4.06	1027/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	15	4.23	882/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	7	13	8	3.87	1015/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	7	4	8	3.81	1139/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	5	10	6	3.78	1001/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1106/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	5	21	4.42	582/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	948/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	8	12	4.28	600/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	712/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	528/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	405/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	759/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	1015/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	3	9	8	3.68	914/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	4	8	9	3.88	957/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	0	4	9	7	3.63	1025/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	3	5	4	10	3.95	467/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	25
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 1	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 07
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 259
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	869/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	677/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	782/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	936/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	881/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	572/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	5	8	4.05	942/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	291/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	956/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	475/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	681/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	829/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	915/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	463/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1140/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1100/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	106/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	89/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	66/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	110/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	101/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 20	Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	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		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 07
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Anderson, Brian (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 260
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	869/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	677/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	782/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	936/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	881/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	572/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	5	8	4.05	942/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	291/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	7	0	3.58	1198/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	2	2	1	6	3.54	1301/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	1167/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1111/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	2	2	6	3.64	1204/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	652/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1140/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1100/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	106/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	89/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	66/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	110/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	101/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 20	Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	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		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	8	11	10	3.76	1257/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	10	15	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	5	9	8	7	3.42	1163/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	9	7	5	3.61	1227/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	9	6	8	3.65	1091/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	1	9	2	5	3.37	1188/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	10	13	3.94	1045/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	27	4.76	836/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	9	9	6	3.76	1081/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	4	6	20	4.42	891/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	5	25	4.71	934/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	9	16	4.23	903/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	6	18	4.23	905/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	3	3	5	5	8	3.50	960/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	6	5	14	3.90	806/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	5	18	4.38	660/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	5	6	12	3.79	981/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	5	5	14	4.24	345/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 08
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 261
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	8	11	10	3.76	1257/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	10	15	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	5	9	8	7	3.42	1163/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	9	7	5	3.61	1227/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	9	6	8	3.65	1091/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	1	9	2	5	3.37	1188/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	10	13	3.94	1045/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	27	4.76	836/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	9	9	3	3.64	1169/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	4	2	17	4.46	850/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	1143/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	1	4	5	11	4.09	1010/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	3	3	12	3.95	1067/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	2	1	3	5	9	3.90	759/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	6	5	14	3.90	806/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	5	18	4.38	660/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	5	6	12	3.79	981/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	5	5	14	4.24	345/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 08
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 262
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 08
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Fedorowski,Jenn (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 263
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	8	11	10	3.76	1257/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	10	15	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	5	9	8	7	3.42	1163/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	9	7	5	3.61	1227/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	9	6	8	3.65	1091/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	1	9	2	5	3.37	1188/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	10	13	3.94	1045/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	27	4.76	836/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	2	17	4	4.09	807/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	536/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	958/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	558/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	689/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	652/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	6	5	14	3.90	806/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	5	18	4.38	660/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	5	6	12	3.79	981/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	5	5	14	4.24	345/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 08
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Fedorowski,Jenn (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 263
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 08
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Wassink,Sarah (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 264
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	8	11	10	3.76	1257/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	10	15	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	5	9	8	7	3.42	1163/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	9	7	5	3.61	1227/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	9	6	8	3.65	1091/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	1	9	2	5	3.37	1188/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	10	13	3.94	1045/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	27	4.76	836/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	17	5	4.17	722/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	536/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	889/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	558/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	637/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	652/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	6	5	14	3.90	806/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	5	18	4.38	660/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	5	6	12	3.79	981/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	5	5	14	4.24	345/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.24
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 08
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Wassink, Sarah (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 264
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 08
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 265
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	889/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	956/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	962/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1211/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	644/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	785/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	5	7	3.71	1180/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	819/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	11	3	3	3.44	1261/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	6	1	12	4.05	1163/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	1042/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	3	12	4.29	855/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	4	2	11	3.76	1165/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	6	2	8	3.89	769/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	0	3	3	3.33	1042/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1094/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1088/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	701/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	75/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	6	2	8	4.13	141/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	83/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	64/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 9			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 08
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Magnanelli, Tim (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 266
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	889/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	956/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	962/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1211/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	644/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	785/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	5	7	3.71	1180/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	819/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	9	4	3.94	929/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	951/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	889/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	793/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	659/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	895/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	0	3	3	3.33	1042/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1094/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1088/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	701/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	75/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	6	2	8	4.13	141/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	83/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	64/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 09
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 267
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	7	13	6	3.79	1245/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	6	9	12	4.11	993/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	10	7	9	3.89	1002/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	0	0	7	7	2	3.69	1195/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	2	4	6	7	3.55	1152/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1172/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	716/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	868/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	5	9	4	3.84	1024/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	684/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	6	16	4.61	1055/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	2	10	9	4.13	979/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	831/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	916/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	5	12	6	3.73	890/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	450/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	0	4	8	11	3.92	925/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	389/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	7	13	6	3.79	1245/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	6	9	12	4.11	993/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	10	7	9	3.89	1002/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	0	0	7	7	2	3.69	1195/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	2	4	6	7	3.55	1152/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1172/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	716/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	868/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	1	5	7	2	3.50	1238/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	755/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	958/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1141/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	877/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	3	0	4	3	2	3.08	1077/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	5	12	6	3.73	890/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	450/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	0	4	8	11	3.92	925/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	389/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 09
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Fedorowski,Jenn (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 269
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	7	13	6	3.79	1245/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	6	9	12	4.11	993/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	10	7	9	3.89	1002/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	0	0	7	7	2	3.69	1195/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	2	4	6	7	3.55	1152/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1172/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	716/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	868/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	679/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	798/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	946/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	607/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	791/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	2	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	943/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	5	12	6	3.73	890/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	450/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	0	4	8	11	3.92	925/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	389/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 09
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 270
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	7	13	6	3.79	1245/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	6	9	12	4.11	993/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	10	7	9	3.89	1002/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	0	0	7	7	2	3.69	1195/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	2	4	6	7	3.55	1152/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1172/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	716/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	868/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	589/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	596/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	844/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	483/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	739/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	748/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	5	12	6	3.73	890/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	450/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	0	4	8	11	3.92	925/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	389/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 09
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 271
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	909/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	689/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	850/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	766/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	751/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	8	6	3.95	870/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	9	7	3.87	1103/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	823/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	581/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	475/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	705/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	420/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	388/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	710/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	640/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	77/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	26/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	44/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	8/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 09
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 271
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 09
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Francisco,Sofia (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 272
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	909/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	689/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	850/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	766/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	751/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	8	6	3.95	870/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	9	7	3.87	1103/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	341/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	414/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	784/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	366/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	534/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	652/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	710/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	640/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	77/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	26/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	44/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	8/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 09
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Francisco,Sofia (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 272
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 10
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Gierasch,Tiffan (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 273
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	1058/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	965/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	923/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	7	4	5	3.58	1238/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	7	6	3.85	952/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	5	7	2	3.60	1088/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	948/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	1008/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	807/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	941/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	317/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	829/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	815/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	975/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	801/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	6	4	9	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	7	1	10	3.85	958/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	7	0	9	4.00	423/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	0	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 10
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Hamilton,Diana (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 274
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	1058/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	965/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	923/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	7	4	5	3.58	1238/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	7	6	3.85	952/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	5	7	2	3.60	1088/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	948/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	1008/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	849/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	941/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	253/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	659/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	593/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	801/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	6	4	9	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	7	1	10	3.85	958/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	7	0	9	4.00	423/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 10
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Polasani,Shavan (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 275
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	1058/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	965/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	923/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	7	4	5	3.58	1238/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	7	6	3.85	952/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	5	7	2	3.60	1088/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	948/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	1008/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	634/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1105/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	815/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	801/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	6	4	9	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	7	1	10	3.85	958/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	7	0	9	4.00	423/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 10
 Title Prin Of Chemistry II
 Instructor: Seeger, Franzisk (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 276
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	1058/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	965/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	923/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	7	4	5	3.58	1238/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	7	6	3.85	952/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	5	7	2	3.60	1088/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	948/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	1008/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	341/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1105/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	431/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	959/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	801/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	6	4	9	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	7	1	10	3.85	958/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	7	0	9	4.00	423/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors		17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	5							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	0	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				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 10
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 277
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1108/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	956/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	798/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	1158/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	572/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	985/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	6	5	4	3.35	1306/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	291/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	786/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	698/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	1125/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	879/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	1030/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	5	1	10	4.06	632/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	899/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1023/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1043/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	3	1	2	0	2.83	769/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	133/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	89/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	135/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	3	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	168/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	3.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	122/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 10
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 277
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 10
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Bediako, Bernice (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 278
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1108/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	956/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	798/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	1158/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	572/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	985/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	6	5	4	3.35	1306/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	291/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	9	2	2	3.06	1343/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1262/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1358/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	1	7	2	3.82	1169/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1246/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1041/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	899/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1023/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1043/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	3	1	2	0	2.83	769/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	133/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	89/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	135/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	3	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	168/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	3.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	122/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 10
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Bediako, Bernice (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 278
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 11
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 279
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	7	6	6	3.80	1238/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	10	7	4.10	993/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	1008/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1153/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	7	4	7	3.70	1057/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	7	5	5	3.88	921/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	6	4	5	3.35	1306/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	836/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	6	5	3	3.67	1150/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	10	7	4.10	1144/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	1055/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	1006/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	7	6	5	3.60	1218/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	2	10	6	4.05	632/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	881/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1094/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	62/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	80/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	136/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	35/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	47/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 11
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Magnanelli, Tim (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 280
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	7	6	6	3.80	1238/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	10	7	4.10	993/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	1008/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1153/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	7	4	7	3.70	1057/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	7	5	5	3.88	921/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	6	4	5	3.35	1306/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	836/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	386/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	921/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1167/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	663/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	709/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	867/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	881/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1094/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	62/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	80/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	136/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	35/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	47/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.50

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	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 12
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 281
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	5	3.73	1269/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	6	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	887/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	4	7	4	3.67	1203/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	3	11	1	3.42	1203/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	9	5	3	3.47	1145/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	7	4	3	6	3.29	1325/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	485/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	2	5	12	0	3.40	1277/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	2	8	8	3.95	1202/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	1125/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	1	8	8	3.95	1087/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	4	7	5	3.43	1265/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	759/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	1079/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1078/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1130/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	2	1	5	8	3.83	162/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	163/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	141/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	57/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.72
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	106/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.06

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 12
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Ambuehl, Stacey (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 282
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	9	5	3.73	1269/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	6	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	887/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	4	7	4	3.67	1203/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	3	11	1	3.42	1203/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	9	5	3	3.47	1145/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	7	4	3	6	3.29	1325/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	485/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	12	4	4.05	823/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1274/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1167/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	962/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1104/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1008/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	1079/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1078/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1130/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	2	1	5	8	3.83	162/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	163/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	141/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	57/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.72
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	106/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.06

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	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	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 13
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 283
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	8	10	4.04	1037/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	532/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	541/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	685/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	430/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	617/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	3	7	9	3.83	1123/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	11	3	4.00	849/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	670/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	748/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	3	4	10	3.86	1128/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	455/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	0	0	7	7	4.06	137/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	114/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	80/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	124/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	47/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	18
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 6	Graduate	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	Under-grad	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Non-major	23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 13
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Anderson, Brian (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 284
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	8	10	4.04	1037/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	532/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	541/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	685/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	430/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	617/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	3	7	9	3.83	1123/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	849/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	1153/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1006/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1018/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	924/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	602/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	0	0	7	7	4.06	137/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	114/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	80/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	124/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	47/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 14
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 285
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	6	6	1	3.00	1411/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	6	4	4	3.21	1376/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1179/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	3	6	3	2	2.88	1374/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	3	4	3	2	3.00	1291/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	3	4	3	2	2.75	1282/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	1	7	4	1	2.63	1392/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	2.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	511/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	3	2	7	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1282/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	1125/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	1	8	3	3.28	1296/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	6	1	2	5	2	2.75	1340/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	3	3	2	4	4	3.19	1055/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	1055/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1053/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1001/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	714/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	130/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	147/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	160/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	158/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	145/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 14
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 285
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 14
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Ambuehl, Stacey (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 286
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	6	6	1	3.00	1411/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	6	4	4	3.21	1376/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1179/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	3	6	3	2	2.88	1374/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	3	4	3	2	3.00	1291/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	3	4	3	2	2.75	1282/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	1	7	4	1	2.63	1392/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	2.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	511/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	956/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	4	3	7	2	3.44	1313/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	3	1	6	6	3.94	1334/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	5	6	3	3.56	1245/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	5	4	4	3.38	1276/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	916/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	1055/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1053/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1001/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	714/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	130/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	147/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	160/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	158/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	145/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 14
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Ambuehl, Stacey (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 286
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 15
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 287
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1027/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1168/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	1	6	2	1	3.30	1179/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	6	3	4	3.85	1113/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	4	3	2	3.15	1272/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1050/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	6	0	4	3.13	1352/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	1273/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	1	9	4.07	1156/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1042/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1018/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1181/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	867/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	122/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	114/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	148/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	99/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 15
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 287
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 15
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Tran,Thao (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 288
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1027/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1168/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	1	6	2	1	3.30	1179/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	6	3	4	3.85	1113/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	4	3	2	3.15	1272/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1050/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	6	0	4	3.13	1352/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	540/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	755/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1072/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	839/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1030/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	911/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	856/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	122/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	114/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	148/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	110/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	99/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102 15
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Tran,Thao (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 288
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 16
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 289
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1318/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1175/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1175/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1359/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	430/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1050/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1325/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	733/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	698/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1081/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1047/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	238/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	786/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	859/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1140/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	864/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	777/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	87/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	160/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	141/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	107/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 102 16
 Title Intro Chemistry Lab I
 Instructor: Tran,Thao (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 290
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1318/1447	3.85	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1175/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1175/1241	3.78	3.92	4.33	4.25	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1359/1402	3.69	3.88	4.24	4.15	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	430/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1050/1316	3.60	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1325/1427	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.24	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1031/1434	3.90	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1317/1387	4.29	4.29	4.46	4.46	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1320/1387	4.56	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1237/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1157/1193	3.80	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	859/1172	3.70	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1140/1182	3.85	3.98	4.35	4.18	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	864/1170	3.68	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	777/ 800	3.81	3.85	4.06	3.95	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	87/ 189	4.24	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 192	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	160/ 186	4.42	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	141/ 187	4.38	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	107/ 168	4.16	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 2
 Title Prin of Chem II-Honors
 Instructor: LaCourse,Willia
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 291
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	709/1447	4.42	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	532/1447	4.54	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	541/1241	4.50	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	494/1402	4.55	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1358	****	3.86	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	549/1316	4.33	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	147/1427	4.53	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	701/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	475/1387	4.86	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.95	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	241/1386	4.69	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	506/1380	4.23	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	149/1193	4.72	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	637/1172	3.87	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1182	5.00	3.98	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1170	4.86	3.85	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	3.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 4
 Title Prin of Chem II-Honors
 Instructor: LaCourse,Willia
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 292
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	695/1447	4.42	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	457/1447	4.54	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1402	4.55	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1427	4.53	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	754/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.86	4.29	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.95	4.52	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	539/1386	4.69	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1138/1380	4.23	4.08	4.32	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	155/1193	4.72	3.77	4.02	3.99	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	970/1172	3.87	3.78	4.15	3.95	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	3.98	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	440/1170	4.86	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	5.00	3.85	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124 02
 Title Gen Organic Biochem La
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 293
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	496/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	575/1447	4.42	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	541/1241	4.38	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	425/1402	4.37	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	672/1358	4.23	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	608/1316	4.29	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	656/1427	4.34	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.69	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	454/1434	4.23	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	712/1387	4.56	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	859/1387	4.67	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	548/1386	4.49	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	729/1380	4.34	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	780/1193	3.82	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	521/1172	4.22	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.47	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	576/1170	4.53	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	423/ 800	3.64	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	71/ 189	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	72/ 192	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	71/ 186	4.45	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	155/ 187	4.08	4.18	4.33	4.37	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	62/ 168	4.27	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 124 02
 Title Gen Organic Biochem La
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 293
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124 02
 Title Gen Organic Biochem La
 Instructor: Manning, Steven (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 294
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	496/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	575/1447	4.42	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	541/1241	4.38	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	425/1402	4.37	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	672/1358	4.23	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	608/1316	4.29	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	656/1427	4.34	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.69	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	7	4	3	3.60	1188/1434	4.23	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1063/1387	4.56	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1272/1387	4.67	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	927/1386	4.49	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1104/1380	4.34	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1193	3.82	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	521/1172	4.22	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.47	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	576/1170	4.53	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	423/ 800	3.64	3.85	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	71/ 189	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	72/ 192	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	71/ 186	4.45	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	155/ 187	4.08	4.18	4.33	4.37	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	62/ 168	4.27	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: CHEM 124 02
 Title Gen Organic Biochem La
 Instructor: Manning, Steven (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 294
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124 03
 Title Gen Organic Biochem La
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 295
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	954/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	9	4.20	911/1447	4.42	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	7	11	4.12	866/1241	4.38	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	854/1402	4.37	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	10	4.21	654/1358	4.23	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	758/1316	4.29	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	7	10	4.04	948/1427	4.34	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	770/1447	4.69	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	701/1434	4.23	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	684/1387	4.56	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	475/1387	4.67	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	733/1386	4.49	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	849/1380	4.34	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	6	13	4.21	517/1193	3.82	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	666/1172	4.22	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	824/1182	4.47	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	549/1170	4.53	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	714/ 800	3.64	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	91/ 189	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	106/ 192	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	151/ 186	4.45	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.24
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	126/ 187	4.08	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.24
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	103/ 168	4.27	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.12
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
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				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 124 03
 Title Gen Organic Biochem La
 Instructor: Manning, Steven (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 296
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	954/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	9	4.20	911/1447	4.42	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	7	11	4.12	866/1241	4.38	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	854/1402	4.37	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	10	4.21	654/1358	4.23	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	758/1316	4.29	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	7	10	4.04	948/1427	4.34	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	770/1447	4.69	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	754/1434	4.23	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	755/1387	4.56	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1055/1387	4.67	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	719/1386	4.49	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	959/1380	4.34	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	6	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	991/1193	3.82	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	666/1172	4.22	3.78	4.15	3.95	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	824/1182	4.47	3.98	4.35	4.18	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	549/1170	4.53	3.85	4.38	4.17	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	714/ 800	3.64	3.85	4.06	3.95	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	91/ 189	4.53	4.30	4.34	4.18	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	106/ 192	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	151/ 186	4.45	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.24
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	126/ 187	4.08	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.24
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	103/ 168	4.27	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.12
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
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				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 124 1
 Title Gen Organic & Biochem
 Instructor: Tracy, Allison M
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 297
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	222/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	30	4.78	228/1447	4.42	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	27	4.66	392/1241	4.38	3.92	4.33	4.25	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	3	1	3	17	4.42	603/1402	4.37	3.88	4.24	4.15	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	2	3	4	15	4.33	529/1358	4.23	3.86	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	212/1316	4.29	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	77/1427	4.34	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	27	6	4.11	1326/1447	4.69	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	114/1434	4.23	3.89	4.10	4.10	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	180/1387	4.56	4.29	4.46	4.46	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	579/1387	4.67	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	30	4.82	229/1386	4.49	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	143/1380	4.34	4.08	4.32	4.31	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	825/1193	3.82	3.77	4.02	3.99	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1172	4.22	3.78	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1182	4.47	3.98	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1170	4.53	3.85	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	30	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	3.64	3.85	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 2
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: LaCourse,Willia (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 298
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	1	4	11	12	4.00	1058/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	7	11	5	3.33	1361/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	3	10	6	7	3.30	1179/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	3	0	3	8	2	3.38	1295/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	4	4	9	9	3.68	1077/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1278/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	2.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	5	2	18	4.00	971/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	1	28	4.83	673/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	0	6	6	9	4.00	849/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	4	5	16	4.14	1118/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	1	0	6	19	4.39	1206/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	2	6	6	12	3.86	1151/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	2	3	6	14	4.04	1020/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	3	3	4	6	5	3.33	1022/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	165/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.81	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	3	2	0	4	7	3.63	174/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	2	0	0	2	12	4.38	135/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	124/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	4	0	1	8	3	3.38	158/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.38	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	22	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	32
			Other	0	Non-major
					6
					26
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 300 2
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: Carpenter,Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 299
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	1	4	11	12	4.00	1058/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	7	11	5	3.33	1361/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	3	10	6	7	3.30	1179/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	3	0	3	8	2	3.38	1295/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	4	4	9	9	3.68	1077/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1278/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	5	2	18	4.00	971/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	1	28	4.83	673/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	996/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	0	1	2	10	4.20	1085/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	2	0	1	2	11	4.25	1260/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	2	0	0	5	6	4.00	1047/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1096/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	165/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	3	2	0	4	7	3.63	174/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	2	0	0	2	12	4.38	135/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	124/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	4	0	1	8	3	3.38	158/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.38
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	22	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	32
			Other	0	Non-major
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			6		26

Course-Section: CHEM 300 2
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: Gray,Andrea (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 300
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	1	4	11	12	4.00	1058/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	7	11	5	3.33	1361/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	3	10	6	7	3.30	1179/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	3	0	3	8	2	3.38	1295/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	4	4	9	9	3.68	1077/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1278/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	5	2	18	4.00	971/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	1	28	4.83	673/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	1	0	2	9	3	3.87	1010/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	1039/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1210/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1010/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1208/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	165/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	3	2	0	4	7	3.63	174/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	2	0	0	2	12	4.38	135/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	124/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	4	0	1	8	3	3.38	158/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.38
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	22	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	32
			Other	0	Major
					Non-major
					6
					26
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	1	4	11	12	4.00	1058/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	7	11	5	3.33	1361/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	3	10	6	7	3.30	1179/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	3	0	3	8	2	3.38	1295/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	4	4	9	9	3.68	1077/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1278/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	5	2	18	4.00	971/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	1	28	4.83	673/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	1	1	2	9	2	3.67	1150/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	1176/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	1276/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	1160/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1284/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	165/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	3	2	0	4	7	3.63	174/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	2	0	0	2	12	4.38	135/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	124/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	4	0	1	8	3	3.38	158/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.38
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	22	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	32
			Other	0	Non-major
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			6	Major	6
			26	Non-major	26

Course-Section: CHEM 300 3
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: LaCourse,Willia (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 302
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	8	12	8	3.93	1128/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	8	9	7	3.62	1278/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	8	8	9	3.76	1068/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1101/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	6	9	9	3.81	980/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1101/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	361/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	9	7	5	3.61	1188/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	6	7	15	4.32	980/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	4	21	4.61	1055/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	6	7	11	3.82	1164/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	6	3	7	11	3.75	1169/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	843/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	102/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	68/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	13/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	50/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	32/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	8	12	8	3.93	1128/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	8	9	7	3.62	1278/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	8	8	9	3.76	1068/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1101/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	6	9	9	3.81	980/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1101/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	361/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	4	11	6	3.95	916/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	798/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	1244/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	705/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	3	0	2	7	3.85	1133/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	102/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	68/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	13/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	50/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	32/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 3
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: Gray,Andrea (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 304
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	8	12	8	3.93	1128/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	8	9	7	3.62	1278/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	8	8	9	3.76	1068/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1101/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	6	9	9	3.81	980/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1101/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	361/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	744/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1018/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	171/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	659/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	102/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	68/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	13/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	50/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	32/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 3
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: Klutse, Charles (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 305
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	8	12	8	3.93	1128/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	8	9	7	3.62	1278/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	8	8	9	3.76	1068/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1101/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	6	9	9	3.81	980/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1101/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	361/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	1	5	11	1	3.67	1150/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1173/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	659/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	102/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	68/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	13/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.95
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	50/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	32/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 4
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: LaCourse,Willia (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 306
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	6	7	3.95	1108/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	7	6	3.80	1210/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	5	8	3.67	1096/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1227/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	966/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	812/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	644/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	646/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	9	5	4.00	849/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	1144/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	656/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	927/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	997/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	843/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	165/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	80/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	117/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	141/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	142/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 4
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: Carpenter, Tara (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 307
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	6	7	3.95	1108/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	7	6	3.80	1210/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	5	8	3.67	1096/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1227/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	966/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	812/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	644/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	646/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	849/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1243/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1143/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	839/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1246/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	960/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	165/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	80/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	117/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	141/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	142/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 4
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: Gray,Andrea (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 308
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	6	7	3.95	1108/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	7	6	3.80	1210/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	5	8	3.67	1096/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1227/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	966/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	812/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	644/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	646/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	942/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1039/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1300/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	719/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1169/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	165/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	80/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	117/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	141/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	142/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 2	Required for Majors	Graduate	0	Major 6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 7	General	Under-grad	21	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0				
				I 0	Other			
				? 3				

Course-Section: CHEM 300 4
 Title Analytical Chemistry
 Instructor: Klutse, Charles (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 309
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	6	7	3.95	1108/1447	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	7	6	3.80	1210/1447	3.58	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	5	8	3.67	1096/1241	3.58	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1227/1402	3.61	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	966/1358	3.78	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	812/1316	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	644/1427	4.32	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	646/1447	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	765/1434	3.91	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1039/1387	4.19	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1320/1387	4.39	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	971/1386	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1169/1380	3.88	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1193	3.58	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	165/ 189	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	80/ 192	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	117/ 186	4.59	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	141/ 187	4.33	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	142/ 168	3.91	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 302 1
 Title Physical Chemistry II
 Instructor: Arnold,Bradley
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 310
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	9	16	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	9	15	4.23	872/1447	4.23	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	587/1241	4.47	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	448/1402	4.55	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	6	6	6	7	3.37	1220/1358	3.37	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	512/1316	4.38	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	6	22	4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	2	2	9	13	3.93	942/1434	3.93	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	1	7	16	4.35	960/1387	4.35	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	889/1387	4.73	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	4	6	12	3.88	1137/1386	3.88	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	2	6	15	4.23	905/1380	4.23	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	4	0	2	2	3	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	17
84-150	8	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						

Course-Section: CHEM 303 1
 Title Phys Chem For Biochem
 Instructor: Geddes,Cris
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 311
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	6	8	12	3.93	1128/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	1	15	8	3.96	1088/1447	3.96	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	5	5	14	3.97	949/1241	3.97	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1203/1402	3.67	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	5	3	4	5	3	2.90	1318/1358	2.90	3.86	4.11	4.10	2.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1120/1316	3.54	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	5	5	1	15	3.69	1192/1427	3.69	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	3	8	9	6	3	2.93	1444/1447	2.93	4.81	4.69	4.65	2.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	8	7	6	3.82	1045/1434	3.82	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	2	8	13	4.15	1111/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	10	9	3.89	1137/1386	3.89	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	1	3	8	12	4.04	1020/1380	4.04	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	4	0	3	6	9	3.73	861/1193	3.73	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	27
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 11	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	30
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		28
			? 3		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 312 2
 Title Advanced Lab II
 Instructor: Mang, Stephen A. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 312
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1058/1447	4.43	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1431/1447	3.39	4.01	4.27	4.23	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	976/1402	4.29	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.64	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	812/1316	4.43	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1259/1427	4.04	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.42	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1377/1387	3.11	4.29	4.46	4.44	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1380/1387	3.61	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1367/1386	2.83	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1317/1380	3.75	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1157/1193	3.42	3.77	4.02	4.05	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	173/ 189	4.04	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	189/ 192	3.00	4.29	4.34	4.20	2.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	181/ 186	3.64	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	176/ 187	3.57	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	150/ 168	3.82	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312 2
 Title Advanced Lab II
 Instructor: Manning, Steven (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 313
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1058/1447	4.43	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1431/1447	3.39	4.01	4.27	4.23	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	976/1402	4.29	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.64	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	812/1316	4.43	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1259/1427	4.04	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	173/ 189	4.04	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	189/ 192	3.00	4.29	4.34	4.20	2.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	181/ 186	3.64	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	176/ 187	3.57	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	150/ 168	3.82	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312 2
 Title Advanced Lab II
 Instructor: Oleske, Jeffrey (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 314
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1058/1447	4.43	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1431/1447	3.39	4.01	4.27	4.23	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	976/1402	4.29	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.64	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	812/1316	4.43	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1259/1427	4.04	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1427/1434	3.42	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	173/ 189	4.04	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	189/ 192	3.00	4.29	4.34	4.20	2.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	181/ 186	3.64	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	176/ 187	3.57	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	150/ 168	3.82	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0	Required for Majors 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 312 3
 Title Advanced Lab II
 Instructor: Mang, Stephen A. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 315
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1447	4.43	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	824/1447	3.39	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	****	3.92	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1402	4.29	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	581/1358	3.64	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1316	4.43	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	373/1427	4.04	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	278/1434	3.42	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	3.11	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	707/1387	3.61	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1047/1386	2.83	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	659/1380	3.75	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	420/1193	3.42	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	73/ 189	4.04	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	147/ 192	3.00	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	148/ 186	3.64	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	136/ 187	3.57	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	99/ 168	3.82	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.14

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 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7	Non-major 0
84-150	3	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		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 312 3
 Title Advanced Lab II
 Instructor: Manning, Steven (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 316
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1447	4.43	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	824/1447	3.39	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	****	3.92	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1402	4.29	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	581/1358	3.64	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1316	4.43	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	373/1427	4.04	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	3.42	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	3.11	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	3.61	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	2.83	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.75	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	73/ 189	4.04	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	147/ 192	3.00	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	148/ 186	3.64	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	136/ 187	3.57	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	99/ 168	3.82	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.14

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	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	3	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				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 312 3
 Title Advanced Lab II
 Instructor: Oleske, Jeffrey (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 317
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1447	4.43	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	824/1447	3.39	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	****	3.92	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1402	4.29	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	581/1358	3.64	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1316	4.43	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	373/1427	4.04	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1277/1434	3.42	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1383/1387	3.11	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1380/1387	3.61	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1380/1386	2.83	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.75	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	73/ 189	4.04	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	147/ 192	3.00	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	148/ 186	3.64	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	136/ 187	3.57	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	99/ 168	3.82	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.14

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	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	3	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				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CHEM 351 02
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 318
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	353/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	415/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	494/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	474/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	700/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	361/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	246/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	496/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	652/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	27/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	59/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	94/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	44/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	73/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 02
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Peters, Hannah (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 319
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	353/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	415/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	494/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	474/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	700/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	361/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1081/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1147/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1360/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	863/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	915/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	27/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	59/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	94/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	44/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	73/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 03
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 320
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	742/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	590/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	782/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	854/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	626/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	671/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	931/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	786/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	891/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	707/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	879/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	887/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	895/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	140/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	116/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	117/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	108/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	69/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 351 03
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Trzeinski,Grego (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 321
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	742/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	590/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	782/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	854/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	626/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	671/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	931/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	786/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	490/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	131/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	140/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	116/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	117/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	108/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	69/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 04
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 322
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	728/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	766/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	751/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	921/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	751/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	727/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	528/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	253/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	506/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	131/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	710/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	979/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	640/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	54/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	68/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	130/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	73/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	77/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.30

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	0	Major	1
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	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 351 04
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Guei,Jules (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 323
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	728/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	766/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	751/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	921/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	751/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	727/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	431/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	626/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1030/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	392/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	710/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	979/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	640/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	54/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	68/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	130/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	73/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	77/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.30

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	0	Major	1
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	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 05
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 324
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	936/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	999/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	989/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	976/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	590/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	962/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	919/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	1291/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	802/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	1023/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1107/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	568/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	791/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	813/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	140/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	43/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	23/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	40/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.57

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351 05
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Bhagchandani, Ya (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 325
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	936/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	999/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	989/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	976/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	590/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	962/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	919/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	1291/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	983/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	611/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	904/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	677/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1000/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	999/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	140/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	43/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	23/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	40/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.57

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351 06
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 326
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	889/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1023/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1021/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1101/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	881/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1216/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1045/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	727/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	600/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	798/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	1185/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	829/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	978/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	652/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	970/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	553/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	710/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	62/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	147/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	117/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	121/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	77/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 10			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	1	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351 06
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Peters, Hannah (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 327
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	889/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1023/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1021/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1101/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	881/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1216/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1045/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	727/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	7	5	2	3.64	1162/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1176/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	6	5	4.00	1320/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1111/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1133/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	555/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	970/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	553/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	710/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	62/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	147/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	117/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	121/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	77/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 07
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 328
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	742/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	947/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	833/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	0	8	4.00	976/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	761/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	700/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	1	8	4.00	971/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	928/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	802/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1055/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	1116/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	962/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	1089/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	593/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	79/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	130/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	156/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	80/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	107/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351 07
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Trzeinski,Grego (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 329
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	742/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	947/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	833/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	0	8	4.00	976/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	761/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	700/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	1	8	4.00	971/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	928/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	206/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	931/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1260/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	775/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1169/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	652/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	79/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	130/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	156/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	80/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	107/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 08
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 330
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	551/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	843/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	717/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	873/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	529/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	729/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	763/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	849/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	755/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	784/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	811/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	759/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	455/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	44/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	43/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	36/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	57/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	55/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351 08
Title Organic Chemistry Lab
Instructor: Smith, Paul J (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2010

Page 330
JUN 28, 2010
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 08
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Guei,Jules (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 331
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	551/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	843/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	717/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	873/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	529/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	729/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	763/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	956/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1176/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1268/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	607/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	815/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	44/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	43/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	36/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	57/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	55/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 351 08
Title Organic Chemistry Lab
Instructor: Guei, Jules (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2010

Page 331
JUN 28, 2010
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 09
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 332
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	507/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	824/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	923/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	745/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	644/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	617/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	823/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	600/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	1015/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	793/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	739/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1065/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	120/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	98/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	117/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	21/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	81/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351 09
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Bhagchandani, Ya (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 333
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	507/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	824/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	923/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	745/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	644/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	617/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	823/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	657/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1105/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	1260/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	879/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1138/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	927/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	120/ 189	4.47	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	98/ 192	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	117/ 186	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	21/ 187	4.66	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	81/ 168	4.32	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351 1
 Title Organic Chemistry I
 Instructor: Whalen,Dale L
 Enrollment: 219
 Questionnaires: 92

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 334
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	5	10	29	48	4.30	820/1447	4.47	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	8	14	32	37	4.08	1011/1447	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	19	26	42	4.13	861/1241	4.18	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	63	1	1	1	8	18	4.41	603/1402	4.21	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	4	12	19	50	4.35	507/1358	4.20	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	69	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	****/1316	3.99	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	4	12	24	22	27	3.63	1219/1427	4.15	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	88	4.96	243/1447	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	2	21	38	20	3.94	942/1434	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	11	30	46	4.38	931/1387	4.42	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	5	16	67	4.70	934/1387	4.53	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	6	16	26	40	4.14	979/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	5	17	23	42	4.14	978/1380	4.28	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	63	5	4	4	6	5	3.08	1077/1193	3.91	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	72	0	2	1	5	7	5	3.60	****/1172	3.79	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	72	0	1	3	1	3	12	4.10	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	73	0	2	0	3	5	9	4.00	****/1170	4.38	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	72	15	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 800	4.67	3.85	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	73	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	21	2.00-2.99	12	C	22	General	0	Under-grad	92	Non-major	88
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Course-Section: CHEM 352 02
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 335
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	1249/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	5	2	3.56	1304/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1002/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1219/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	736/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1075/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	1156/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	538/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1117/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1039/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1099/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1184/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1030/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	555/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	162/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	168/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	170/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	160/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	148/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	4.01	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352 02
Title Organic Chemistry Lab
Instructor: Fishbein, James
Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2010

Page 335
JUN 28, 2010
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352 03
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 336
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1159/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1053/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	4.30	743/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	873/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	799/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	738/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	842/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1125/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	902/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1055/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	927/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1030/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1022/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	691/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1013/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	73/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	74/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	60/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	2	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	171/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	107/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 03
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Gantert-Festin, (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 337
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1159/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1053/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	4.30	743/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	873/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	799/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	738/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	842/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1395/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	691/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1013/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	73/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	74/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	60/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	2	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	171/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	107/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352 04
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 338
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1230/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1370/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	1106/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1354/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	1	0	3	2.60	1337/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	1288/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	1	2	2	2.91	1368/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	2.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	3	4	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	1250/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	0	7	2	3.64	1356/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1228/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	0	1	6	3.55	1234/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1168/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	2.33

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	171/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	164/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	178/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	184/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	2.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	165/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 11
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		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 352 06
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 339
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1058/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1210/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1197/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	976/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	452/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	617/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1144/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	849/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	656/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1055/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	927/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1030/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	895/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	113/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	107/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 06
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Nguyen,Nguyen (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 340
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1058/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1210/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1197/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	976/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	452/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	617/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1144/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1407/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	113/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	107/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 07
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 341
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1214/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1053/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	4.33	717/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	976/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	966/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1088/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1359/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	958/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1150/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1282/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1289/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1160/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1138/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1146/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	43/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	104/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	98/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	139/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 08
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 342
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	927/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	4	3.67	1262/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	1	6	3	3.43	1161/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	1264/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	5	3	3	3.43	1203/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	774/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	3	5	4	3.47	1271/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	619/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1253/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1055/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1308/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1018/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	1030/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1087/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	154/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	142/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	174/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	181/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	2.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	1	0	4	3.33	160/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5	Graduate	0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 2	Under-grad	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Major	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Non-major	12
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	0

Course-Section: CHEM 352 09
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 343
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1303/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1388/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1068/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1183/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	581/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	968/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	2	3	3.50	1259/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1314/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1349/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1278/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1293/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	960/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	87/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	178/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	160/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	182/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	2.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	168/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	2.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 1
 Title Organic Chemistry II
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M
 Enrollment: 136
 Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 344
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	2	13	12	38	4.27	849/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	13	24	27	4.15	947/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	10	26	28	4.21	814/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	30	1	1	13	10	11	3.81	1139/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	14	0	0	9	16	27	4.35	518/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	44	0	3	8	4	7	3.68	1038/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	12	13	41	4.44	554/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	62	4.94	339/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	0	16	25	12	3.87	1003/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	7	23	33	4.34	970/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	4	58	4.85	681/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	3	23	17	20	3.77	1188/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	3	21	14	22	3.69	1188/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	2	3	14	17	17	3.83	796/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	61	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	61	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	61	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	60	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 51	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	18	2.00-2.99 1	C 13	General 0	Under-grad 69 Non-major 65
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 13	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 22	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 352 10
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 345
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	927/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1210/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	658/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1245/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1125/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	812/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1184/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1003/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	902/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	946/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	839/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	549/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	843/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	67/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	34/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	172/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	187/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	1.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	135/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	3	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352 11
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 346
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1411/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1400/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	923/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1330/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1330/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1257/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1331/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1389/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1333/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1380/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1349/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1340/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1177/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	184/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	183/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	181/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	185/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	160/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 12
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 347
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1058/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1053/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	891/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	900/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	608/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	950/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1234/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	849/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	891/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1260/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1030/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1157/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	133/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	114/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	135/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	163/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	130/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352 12
Title Organic Chemistry Lab
Instructor: Fishbein, James (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2010

Page 347
JUN 28, 2010
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 352 12
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Ghann, William (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 348
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1058/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1053/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	891/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	900/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	608/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	950/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1234/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	673/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1312/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	133/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	114/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	135/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	163/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	130/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 352 12
Title Organic Chemistry Lab
Instructor: Ghann, William (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2010

Page 348
JUN 28, 2010
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 352 13
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 349
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	648/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	478/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	976/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1203/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1240/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1359/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	754/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	798/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1081/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	539/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	652/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	173/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	43/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	52/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	160/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	150/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 14
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 350
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1214/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1034/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	797/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	987/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	617/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1312/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1088/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1092/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1304/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1010/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1030/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	652/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	165/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	3.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	130/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	169/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	3.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	183/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	2.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	142/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	3.73

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 15
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Fishbein, James (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 351
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1058/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	766/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1034/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1203/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1138/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	939/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1180/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	754/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	698/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1081/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	652/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	999/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	856/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	576/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	89/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	104/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	175/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	47/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352 15
 Title Organic Chemistry Lab
 Instructor: Nguyen,Nguyen (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 352
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1058/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	766/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1034/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1203/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1138/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	939/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1180/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1030/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	999/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	856/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	576/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	89/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	104/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	175/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	47/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 2
 Title Organic Chemistry II
 Instructor: Perks, Harry M
 Enrollment: 197
 Questionnaires: 107

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 353
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	5	16	28	56	4.25	869/1447	3.93	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	10	24	49	20	3.69	1254/1447	3.83	4.01	4.27	4.23	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	8	18	42	34	3.89	1002/1241	3.93	3.92	4.33	4.33	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	57	3	7	10	12	17	3.67	1199/1402	3.80	3.88	4.24	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	1	22	19	50	4.28	581/1358	3.84	3.86	4.11	4.10	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	69	4	4	8	11	10	3.51	1129/1316	3.76	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.51
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	17	28	55	4.23	811/1427	3.64	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	4	98	4.90	485/1447	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	2	4	23	43	17	3.78	1073/1434	3.58	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	6	4	18	44	33	3.90	1230/1387	4.15	4.29	4.46	4.44	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	11	91	4.87	604/1387	4.33	4.52	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	9	5	38	32	21	3.49	1263/1386	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	9	10	24	32	28	3.58	1223/1380	3.92	4.08	4.32	4.32	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	7	10	18	25	27	3.63	911/1193	3.36	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	101	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	****/1172	4.08	3.78	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	101	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	****/1182	4.17	3.98	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	101	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/1170	4.08	3.85	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	101	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	103	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 189	4.22	4.30	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	103	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 192	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	103	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 186	4.24	4.40	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	103	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 187	3.35	4.18	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	103	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 168	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	82	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	38						
56-83	23	2.00-2.99	8	C	19	General	0	Under-grad	107	Non-major	96
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	29	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Course-Section: CHEM 401 1
 Title Chem/Stat Thermodynami
 Instructor: Kelly,Lisa A
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 354
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	496/1447	4.58	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	447/1447	4.58	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	380/1241	4.67	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	314/1402	4.67	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	529/1358	4.33	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	122/1316	4.82	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	133/1427	4.83	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	4	1	6	1	0	2.33	1445/1447	2.33	4.81	4.69	4.72	2.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	611/1434	4.27	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	684/1387	4.58	4.29	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.52	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	262/1193	4.55	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	261/1172	4.70	3.78	4.15	4.25	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	400/1182	4.70	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	480/1170	4.67	3.85	4.38	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	267/ 800	4.38	3.85	4.06	4.19	4.38

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 405 1
 Title Inorganic Chemistry
 Instructor: Daniel,Marie-Ch
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 355
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	675/1241	4.39	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	735/1402	4.29	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	1036/1358	3.73	3.86	4.11	4.15	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	534/1316	4.36	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	634/1434	4.25	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	891/1387	4.41	4.29	4.46	4.48	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	1072/1387	4.59	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	847/1386	4.29	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	593/1380	4.56	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	583/1193	4.13	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.78	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1078/1182	3.50	3.98	4.35	4.49	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1025/1170	3.63	3.85	4.38	4.51	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	547/ 800	3.83	3.85	4.06	4.19	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 435 1
 Title Cpx Carbohydrates
 Instructor: Bush, C A
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 356
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	709/1447	4.41	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	2	8	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	646/1241	4.41	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	616/1402	4.40	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	3	2	6	3.38	1220/1358	3.38	3.86	4.11	4.15	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1316	****	3.78	4.14	4.27	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	906/1427	4.12	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1010/1434	3.87	3.89	4.10	4.17	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	769/1387	4.53	4.29	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	579/1387	4.88	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	847/1386	4.29	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	799/1380	4.35	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	536/1193	4.19	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	859/1172	3.80	3.78	4.15	4.25	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.30	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.29	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.40	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.09	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: CHEM 435 1
 Title Cpx Carbohydrates
 Instructor: Bush, C A
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 356
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 437 2
 Title Biochemistry Laborator
 Instructor: Tracy,Allison M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 357
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1447	4.85	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.76	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	313/1241	4.52	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	249/1402	4.72	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1170/1358	3.95	3.86	4.11	4.15	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	352/1316	4.59	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	410/1427	4.74	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	93/1434	4.25	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.29	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1018/1387	4.80	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1386	4.79	4.17	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1380	4.93	4.08	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	813/1193	4.15	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	5.00	3.78	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	3.98	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	3.85	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	41/ 189	4.91	4.30	4.34	4.74	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/ 192	4.87	4.29	4.34	4.61	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	26/ 186	4.61	4.40	4.48	4.72	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 187	4.83	4.18	4.33	4.59	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	15/ 168	4.65	4.09	4.20	4.53	4.78
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.80	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	41/ 58	4.33	4.33	4.41	4.59	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	47/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.55	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.43	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437 2
 Title Biochemistry Laborator
 Instructor: Macdonald,Jane (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 358
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1447	4.85	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.76	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	313/1241	4.52	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	249/1402	4.72	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1170/1358	3.95	3.86	4.11	4.15	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	352/1316	4.59	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	410/1427	4.74	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	540/1434	4.25	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.29	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	859/1387	4.80	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1386	4.79	4.17	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	4.93	4.08	4.32	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	5.00	3.78	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	3.98	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	3.85	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	41/ 189	4.91	4.30	4.34	4.74	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/ 192	4.87	4.29	4.34	4.61	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	26/ 186	4.61	4.40	4.48	4.72	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 187	4.83	4.18	4.33	4.59	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	15/ 168	4.65	4.09	4.20	4.53	4.78
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.80	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	41/ 58	4.33	4.33	4.41	4.59	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	47/ 65	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.55	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.43	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437 3
 Title Biochemistry Laborator
 Instructor: Tracy,Allison M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 359
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.85	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.76	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	683/1241	4.52	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.72	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	608/1358	3.95	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	274/1316	4.59	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	106/1427	4.74	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.25	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.29	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.80	4.52	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	539/1386	4.79	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.93	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	288/1193	4.15	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	5.00	3.78	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	5.00	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	5.00	3.85	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 189	4.91	4.30	4.34	4.74	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 192	4.87	4.29	4.34	4.61	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	124/ 186	4.61	4.40	4.48	4.72	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	60/ 187	4.83	4.18	4.33	4.59	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	40/ 168	4.65	4.09	4.20	4.53	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 437 3
 Title Biochemistry Laborator
 Instructor: Macdonald,Jane (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 360
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.85	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.76	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	683/1241	4.52	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.72	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	608/1358	3.95	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	274/1316	4.59	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	106/1427	4.74	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1003/1434	4.25	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.29	4.46	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.80	4.52	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1386	4.79	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1380	4.93	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1193	4.15	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	5.00	3.78	4.15	4.25	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	5.00	3.98	4.35	4.49	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	5.00	3.85	4.38	4.51	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 189	4.91	4.30	4.34	4.74	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 192	4.87	4.29	4.34	4.61	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	124/ 186	4.61	4.40	4.48	4.72	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	60/ 187	4.83	4.18	4.33	4.59	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	40/ 168	4.65	4.09	4.20	4.53	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437 3
 Title Biochemistry Laborator
 Instructor: Tomney,Matthew (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 361
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.85	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.76	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	683/1241	4.52	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.72	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	608/1358	3.95	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	274/1316	4.59	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	106/1427	4.74	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1269/1434	4.25	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1387	5.00	4.29	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1387	4.80	4.52	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1386	4.79	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1380	4.93	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1193	4.15	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	5.00	3.78	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	5.00	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1170	5.00	3.85	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 189	4.91	4.30	4.34	4.74	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	26/ 192	4.87	4.29	4.34	4.61	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	124/ 186	4.61	4.40	4.48	4.72	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	60/ 187	4.83	4.18	4.33	4.59	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	40/ 168	4.65	4.09	4.20	4.53	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 438 1
 Title Comprehensive Biochem
 Instructor: Karpel, R L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 362
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	9	11	21	4.29	829/1447	4.29	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	3	9	11	14	3.68	1254/1447	3.68	4.01	4.27	4.31	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	6	6	10	14	3.54	1134/1241	3.54	3.92	4.33	4.41	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	5	3	7	9	3.72	1178/1402	3.72	3.88	4.24	4.34	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	2	15	18	4.18	681/1358	4.18	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	12	1	2	5	9	10	3.93	890/1316	3.93	3.78	4.14	4.27	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	5	7	6	8	14	3.47	1268/1427	3.48	4.00	4.19	4.20	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	291/1447	4.95	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	4	6	14	10	1	2.94	1368/1434	3.33	3.89	4.10	4.17	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	7	12	10	8	3.38	1319/1387	3.87	4.29	4.46	4.48	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	4	5	9	22	4.22	1272/1387	4.29	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	7	7	9	11	5	3.00	1328/1386	3.51	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	6	10	11	7	3.17	1305/1380	3.65	4.08	4.32	4.34	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	7	3	6	8	9	3.27	1037/1193	3.53	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	38	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 35	Graduate 5 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 37 Non-major 41
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 8	D 2		
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 438 1
 Title Comprehensive Biochem
 Instructor: Olson, Wendy J (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 363
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	9	11	21	4.29	829/1447	4.29	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	3	9	11	14	3.68	1254/1447	3.68	4.01	4.27	4.31	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	6	6	10	14	3.54	1134/1241	3.54	3.92	4.33	4.41	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	5	3	7	9	3.72	1178/1402	3.72	3.88	4.24	4.34	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	2	15	18	4.18	681/1358	4.18	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	12	1	2	5	9	10	3.93	890/1316	3.93	3.78	4.14	4.27	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	5	7	6	8	14	3.47	1268/1427	3.48	4.00	4.19	4.20	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	291/1447	4.95	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	11	13	8	3.71	1117/1434	3.33	3.89	4.10	4.17	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	5	9	23	4.36	951/1387	3.87	4.29	4.46	4.48	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	16	19	4.36	1222/1387	4.29	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	8	15	14	4.03	1038/1386	3.51	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	5	14	17	4.13	984/1380	3.65	4.08	4.32	4.34	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	3	4	10	10	3.79	819/1193	3.53	3.77	4.02	4.00	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	****/1172	****	3.78	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	****/1182	****	3.98	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/1170	****	3.85	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	38	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	5	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	41
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 461 3
 Title Adv Instrumental Metho
 Instructor: Cullum,Brian M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 364
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	231/1241	4.80	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	165/1402	4.80	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	746/1358	4.10	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1316	4.67	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.00	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	88/1434	4.33	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.56	4.29	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.78	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	253/1386	4.49	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	224/1193	4.60	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.33	3.78	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	691/1182	4.33	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	710/1170	4.33	3.85	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	3.85	4.06	4.19	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 189	4.88	4.30	4.34	4.74	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	114/ 192	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.61	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.88	4.40	4.48	4.72	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	138/ 187	4.13	4.18	4.33	4.59	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	84/ 168	4.25	4.09	4.20	4.53	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 461 3
 Title Adv Instrumental Metho
 Instructor: Mang,Stephen A. (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 365
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	231/1241	4.80	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	165/1402	4.80	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	746/1358	4.10	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1316	4.67	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.00	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	701/1434	4.33	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	970/1387	4.56	4.29	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	982/1387	4.78	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	811/1386	4.49	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1380	4.80	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1193	4.60	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.33	3.78	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	691/1182	4.33	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	710/1170	4.33	3.85	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	3.85	4.06	4.19	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 189	4.88	4.30	4.34	4.74	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	114/ 192	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.61	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.88	4.40	4.48	4.72	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	138/ 187	4.13	4.18	4.33	4.59	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	84/ 168	4.25	4.09	4.20	4.53	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 461 3
 Title Adv Instrumental Metho
 Instructor: Zukowski,Eli (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 366
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	231/1241	4.80	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	165/1402	4.80	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	746/1358	4.10	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1316	4.67	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.00	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	996/1434	4.33	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	970/1387	4.56	4.29	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	982/1387	4.78	4.52	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	811/1386	4.49	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1380	4.80	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1193	4.60	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.33	3.78	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	691/1182	4.33	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	710/1170	4.33	3.85	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	3.85	4.06	4.19	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 189	4.88	4.30	4.34	4.74	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	114/ 192	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.61	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.88	4.40	4.48	4.72	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	138/ 187	4.13	4.18	4.33	4.59	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	84/ 168	4.25	4.09	4.20	4.53	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 465 01
 Title Mass Spectrometry
 Instructor: Fabris,Daniele
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 367
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1241	4.75	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.71	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	519/1316	4.38	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	754/1434	4.14	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.88	4.29	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.52	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	483/1386	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	593/1193	4.13	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	999/1172	3.50	3.78	4.15	4.25	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1078/1182	3.50	3.98	4.35	4.49	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1070/1170	3.50	3.85	4.38	4.51	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.85	4.06	4.19	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490 03
 Title Special Topics In Chem
 Instructor: Smith,Paul J
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 368
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	232/1447	4.82	4.05	4.31	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	217/1447	4.79	4.01	4.27	4.31	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	334/1241	4.70	3.92	4.33	4.41	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	207/1402	4.77	3.88	4.24	4.34	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	15	4.41	452/1358	4.41	3.86	4.11	4.15	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	128/1316	4.81	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	120/1427	4.86	4.00	4.19	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	328/1434	4.52	3.89	4.10	4.17	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	276/1387	4.85	4.29	4.46	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.52	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	261/1380	4.81	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	574/1193	4.14	3.77	4.02	4.00	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	377/1172	4.50	3.78	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	553/1182	4.50	3.98	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.86	3.85	4.38	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 800	****	3.85	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	5.00	4.58	4.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.33	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	5.00	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 4 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		